UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Counterpoint:

An Analysis of Eurocentrism in Canadian Native Educational Academic Discourse

By

Barbara Quinn ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

International/Intercultural Education

Department of Education Foundations

Edmonton, Alberta

Spring, 1999

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
Acquisitions et services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-39585-5

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Barbara Quinn

TITLE OF THESIS: Counterpoint: An Analysis of Eurocentrism in Canadian Native Educational Academic Discourse

DEGREE: Doctor of Philosophy

YEAR DEGREE GRANTED: 1999

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's written permission.

April 16, 1999

Burnt Norton

Time present and time past
Are both perhaps present in time future
And time future contained in time past.
If all time is eternally present
All time is unredeemable.
What might have been is an abstraction
Remaining a perpetual possibility
Only in a world of speculation.
What might have been and what has been
Point to one end, which is always present.
Footfalls echo in the memory
Down the passage which we did not take
Towards the door we never opened
Into the rose-garden. My words echo
Thus, in your mind.
                                    But to what purpose
Disturbing the dust on a bowl of rose-leaves
I do not know.

                                        Other echoes
Inhabit the garden. Shall we follow?
Quick, said the bird, find them, find them,
Round the corner. Through the first gate,
Into our first world, shall we follow
The deception of the thrush? Into our first world.
There they were, dignified, invisible,
Moving without pressure, over the dead leaves,
In the autumn heat, through the vibrant air,
And the bird called, in response to
The unheard music hidden in the shrubbery,
And the unseen eyebeam crossed, for the roses
Had the look of flowers that are looked at,
There they were as our guest, accepted and accepting.
So we moved, and they, in a formal pattern,
Along the empty alley, into the box circle,
To look down into the drained pool.
Dry the pool, dry concrete, brown edged,
And the pool was filled with water out of sunlight,
And the lotos rose, quietly, quietly,
The surface glittered out of heart of light,
And they were behind us, reflected in the pool.

Then a cloud passed, and the pool was empty.
Go, go, go, said the bird: human kind
Cannot bear very much reality.
Time past and time future
What might have been and what has been
Point to one end, which is always present.

(T.S. Elliot, 1935)

This study is dedicated to Benjamin, Justin, Logan and Elizabeth.

May the "what might have been and what has been" in your lives, be marked by choice and not by necessity.

ABSTRACT

This study directs itself to an investigation of the predominant underlying theories of culture and education used in Canadian Native educational academic discourse. The argument put forth in this dissertation is that the governing cultural and educational theories utilized in this body of knowledge serve to rationalize and legitimate the educational and societal exclusion of First Nation(s) peoples. Chapter One briefly outlines the cultural and educational theories currently dominating the discourse and discusses some personal reasons for my concern with these theories. Chapter Two discusses the theoretical concepts taken up to investigate and critique the prevailing theories found in Native educational discourse. Chapter Three lays out the textual methodology used in the discursive analysis of this particular body of knowledge. Chapter Four provides a general overview of the Native educational literature produced over the last twenty-five years and begins the analysis of the inherent theoretical difficulties with the identified "cultural determinist" and "equality of opportunity" educational theories. Chapter Five offers an example of deconstruction, the discursive analysis technique used in this thesis to demonstrate the embeddedness of "cultural determinist" and "equality of opportunity" theoretical perspectives in the dominant Native educational discourse. Chapter Six investigates the historical origins of cultural determinism and argues that in much of Native educational discourse, the term culture is synonymous with race. Finally, Chapter Seven pinpoints a number of counter positions found in Native educational discourse and discusses some theoretical and pedagogical possibilities for undermining and displacing these prevailing cultural and educational theories.

Acknowledgments

This journey would not have taken place without the support of a number of wonderful people. Marilyn Assheton-Smith, a true mentor, allowed me the space to make this journey and the respect and patience to make it on my own terms. Stan Wilson's insight and sensitive readings proved invaluable to thinking through some of the subtler aspects of this dissertation. Pat McCormack gives new meaning to the word shape-shifter. Her countless hours of editing and suggestions on how to better articulate what I wanted to say are much appreciated. Thanks also to Dr Bill Maynes, Dr. Julia Ellis, Dr. Heather Blair and Dr. Celia Haig-Brown for their time and attention to this study.

I am also indebted to my family and friends. My mother, Belinda Plowman, who believed and supported me in ways only a mother can. Without her help I would not have been able to finish this study. Barbara Mousseau's compassionate nature and steadying hand have helped me navigate my life for as long as I can remember. A better friend could not be had then Kelly Murphy, who spent endless hours listening and whose critical insights enlightened this dissertation. Finally, I am forever beholden to Reuben Quinn who came into my life at a time when I needed someone to lean on the most.

Table of Contents

Prologue

Chapter One: Inside Information 1

Introduction........ 1
Inside "Information": Personal Experiences with Cultural "Difference" and Schooling........ 5
"Inside" Information: Culture, Education and the Myth of "Equality of Opportunity"........ 9
Counterpoint........ 12

Chapter Two: Theoretical Counterpoint 16

Theoretical Choices........ 17
Discourse and Ideology........ 23
The Production of Knowledge - Modern/Postmodern/Poststructural Theory........ 30
  Modern Theory........ 31
  Postmodern/Poststructural Social Theory........ 32
Modernist Pedagogy........ 37
Critical Pedagogy........ 38
Critical Feminist Pedagogy........ 43

Chapter Three: Methodological Counterpoint 46

Discursive Choices........ 46
The Question of Voice........ 50
The Text........ 51
Methodological Choices........ 52
Derrida and Deconstruction........ 53
Foucault and Subjugated Knowledges........ 55
Regimes of Truth........ 56

Chapter Four: Cultural Determinism - Review of a Discourse 58

Macrosystemic Explanation - Group Dynamics........ 60
Microsystemic Explanation - First Nation(s) "Others" and Education........ 64
Cultural Conflict........ 66
Cultural Conflict and Education........ 69
The Construction of Culture in Native Educational Discourse........ 73
Acculturation Theory........ 77
Cultural Determinism: The Essence of the Modernist "Line"........ 79

Chapter Five: Never Confuse Motion with Progress 83

- Postmodern Theory and Native Education 83
- Deconstructing Foreman and Ryan 91
- Cultural Determinism, Education and Liberal Ideology 92
  - Liberal Ideology 93
  - Meritocratic Ideology in Education 95
- Cultural Paralysis 96
  - Positive Exclusions 97
  - Negative Exclusions 98
- The Authoritative Voice 100
- Meaning, Power and Discourse 103
- The Ideology of Difference 104
- Ideological Strategies and the Construction of Culture 106

Chapter Six: Once Upon A Time 111

- Race and Ideology 112
- The Concept of Culture 113
- Key Words 114
- The Construction of Race 118
- The Emergence of Nationhood 119
- Scientific Empiricism 122
- Racialized Discourse and Native Education 126
  - Discursive Preconceptuals 126
- The Ideological Nature of Racialized Discourse 128
- Cognition, Ideology and First Nation(s) "Others" 130
- Central Premises: Neo-Darwinism and the Evolutionist Voice 131
  - Biological Determinism 132
  - Environmental Determinism 134
- Racist Ideology 139

Chapter Seven: Countertheme 142

- Counterpoint Discourses and Native Education 142
  - Alternative Cultural Theory 143
  - Critical Pedagogy 145
  - Dispositional Knowledge 146
  - The Euro-Centric "Other" 152
  - "Counter point" Voices in Native Educational Discourse 155
  - Countertheme 158

Epilogue 160

References 164

Prologue

Several weeks before the defense of this dissertation, I was asked by a committee member what I considered at the time, an unusual question. He remarked that he didn't see me in this work and wondered why that was. "See me?" I asked. " Do you mean politically?" "No" I was told. "I know where you have positioned yourself politically, what I can't find in here is you." "Aaah!" I was being asked why I hadn't appeared at a personal level in this work. Later, when I got home and had a chance to think about what we had talked about, I realized that this was indeed a legitimate question. If I was going to talk about my family in this dissertation then why shouldn't I be prepared to talk about myself as well? And so as a way of introduction to this study, I would like to tell you a little bit about myself. What defines me both personally and politically in this work is that I am in a position of being the "standard" against which "others" are measured, with a peculiar twist. The "others" in this case are people near and dear to me, and whose lives I have been able to do no more then bear witness to.

I married a Native man not because he was "Native" but because he was a man with whom I fell in love. Aaah, good old liberalism! I had always been taught that we are all the same and there is equal opportunity for anyone to be and do whatever they want. How amazingly naive I was. Reflecting back, when the harsh reality of this world set in and I came to the painful understanding that to be married to a Native man meant "Native" was going to be the operative word in my social relations and that we would be marked outside the mainstream, I started to panic. How on earth would my children survive this? Knowing that the hardest stretch of their lives would be in school, I decided to become a teacher. I hoped this would provide me with a means of protecting them to some degree from the world they would enter when they went to school. However, after my brief teaching experience in a First Nation(s) school, I realized this was probably not the best protection I could provide and went back to do my Masters and subsequently my Ph.D. to see what else I might be able to do.

It was in this journey through academia that I came head to head with critical pedagogy - not a pleasant experience but one which introduced me to the concept of "White privilege". I had choice. I could go any where, do virtually anything I wished, I was entitled - I was part of the "in" crowd. This was certainly not the case for the rest of my family. The "other" people in my life had no such privilege. I became cognizant of the social fact that I was the reason the people I loved were constructed as "other".

Being a white, heterosexual, able-bodied person is the reason that the people in my life are subjected to pain, degradation and exclusion. ***I do not consider myself absent, but fully present in this text***, because the academic community in which I work and the society in which I live are always present in Native educational discourse. It is, after all, a discourse foremostly written by Euro-Canadians - those individuals whose absence is marked by their always present construction of "others" reality. I also know that no matter how many tears I wipe away or how personally involved I am, I will never experience the struggles my husband and children have to go through every day of their lives in light of the standards this society has set for them and that I meet carte blanche simply because of who I am.

It has been my intent in this study to create spaces in the discourse. Hopefully in these spaces, "others" will be able to speak in their own voices. It is my belief that one of the ways these spaces can be created, is by getting those whose "talk" is privileged simply by being born with the approved set of social and physical criteria, to start thinking about the unnecessary human restriction and exclusion that is caused when main-stream identities and realities are assembled on the backs of those constructed as outside the norm.

This is what this study is about. It is an attempt to make the invisible reality against which "others" are measured visible. It is a work that strives to unveil the underlying presence of Euro-centrism in Native educational discourse. Specifically, it is an attempt to explore Native educational discourse as a "regime of truth". It is an investigation into how meaning and power impact in this discourse, exploring what purposes this "regime of truth" has served in the construction of Native identities and their socio-educational reality within a broader context of asymmetrical relations. To do so, this study analyzes how the cultural theories and concepts used to construct the "other" are linked to certain educational philosophies and theories in the Native educational discourse to authorize Euro-Canadian power, legitimacy and entitlement through a socio-historical ideological framework that excludes, denigrates, and denies "other's" voices and opportunities in the area of formal schooling.

Chapter One

Inside Information

Take up the White Man's Burden —
Send forth the best ye breed —
Go bind your sons to exile
To serve your captives' needs;
To wait in heavy harness,
On fluttered folk and wild —
Your new-caught sullen peoples,
Half-devil and half child (Rudyard Kipling,1920).

Introduction

Native educational literature is a body of knowledge explicitly concerned with the education of First Nation(s) peoples[1]. It has a lengthy history, framed by Western colonialism and its global push for national sovereignty, territory and power. It is a body of knowledge whose origins lie in the colonial imperatives of 18th century Europe and one consuming question: how could European education be used to "civilize" and "assimilate" the sauvage? Much of the present day Native educational literature grew from this question. European society took what it saw in "Indian" societies and "Indian" people and developed educational theory and pedagogy geared towards the absorption of the Indian population into Euro-Canadian society in ways that were neither visible, offensive nor threatening to non-Indians. In 1768, Father Le Jeune of the Recollect order wrote,

---

[1] Several points of clarification are needed in reference to the term First Nation(s) peoples. First, I have chosen to use the plural term First Nation(s) peoples since I wish to stress the point that there are many First Nation(s) groups and that these groups are made up of multiple voices, perspectives and locations. Second, I take the term First Nation(s) to mean those individuals whose ancestors were the original occupants of Canada. In Native educational discourse, the term First Nations(s) often refers only to those Native people who hold Treaty status, particularly those who reside on reserves. This excludes rather a lot of individuals. I am beginning to wonder if this might be one of the ways the discourse works to retain its socio-historical shape.

> In order to wean them [the sauvage] from their native customs and to give them an opportunity of learning the French language, virtue and manners, that they may afterwards assist their country women, we have decided to send two or three of them to France (Thwaites, 1897(b):145).

At its core, it was a question that arose from a belief that "Indians were backward, savage, uncivilized and childlike" (Perley,1993:20). Coupled with this belief was the conviction that it was the responsibility of the "advanced" Western nations to assist the more primitive peoples adapt to the challenges of the modern world.

The colonial agenda of Indian civilization and assimilation was made official government policy in 1868 under a piece of legislation known as the Indian Act. The Indian Act provided a separate code of rules and regulations for those the federal government defined as "Indian". The Act included an education section which outlined who would go to school, where they would go to school, how long they would go and what they would learn (Longboat,1987:31/32). While Indian education from the late 1800's to the1970's assumed new shapes in various changes from mission schools to boarding schools to integration with public schools, its objectives remained the same. From the 18th century, seminary, industrial, day and residential schools were implemented by the colonizer to "advance" the state of the Indian through education. The final goal of this education was to erase all vestiges of Indian culture and to replace it with European culture.

However, over the course of Canadian history, the federal government's long term educational goals for First Nation(s) peoples changed. The transformation was the result of a number of factors, including the long standing "active" role played by Indigenous people(s) in protecting their communities and identities. Not surprisingly, this proactive stance taken by First Nation(s) peoples has existed for as long as the colonial agenda itself. This educational counterpoint, woven throughout the long history of Native education is evidenced by the tremendous difficulties people like Father Le Jeune had convincing Indian communities to send their children to early seminary schools.

> They [the Huron] said that the children were dependent upon their parents, that the way was rough and wearisome, that the mothers had tender hearts (Thwaites,1897(a):89).

By the 1970's, civilization and assimilation were no longer the stated objectives that drove government and educational policy. For First Nation(s) peoples, the culmination of many long years of fighting colonialism for the legal right to control their own lives came in the form of "The Red Paper", produced by the Indian Association of Alberta in 1970. Picked up by the National Indian Brotherhood in 1972, two of the most important recommendations this document made were that the only solution to Native problems lay in Native hands and the basis for this solution lay in control of their own education. The federal government accepted, in principle, this paper almost immediately and initiated the process of transferring responsibility for education to First Nation(s) communities (Barman et al. 1987:2).

Native educational literature matched this change in position and started to ask a different question: How could formal schooling help to "give back" Native culture to Native peoples and engender autonomy and self-determination? No longer intent on wiping Native culture off the faces of Native children, the prevailing focus in the discourse was on finding curricular and pedagogical ways of painting it back on. Two significant conclusions were reached. The first was that Native *cultural curriculum* had to be included along with Euro-Canadian *academic curriculum*. The second was that Native children had to be taught in a manner similiar with the ways in which they were taught at home and in their communities. The learning mismatch between the home and school needed to be addressed if Native children were to be successful at school. This educational success would provide the possibility of future cultural cohesion and socio-political independence. Put simply, the governing Native educational literature reversed its position. Instead of using formal schooling as a tool to "civilize" and "assimilate" the "Indian", it focused on using formal schooling to regenerate Native culture and autonomy. It is still the major objective proposed in the literature.

Despite this admirable reversal in Native educational literature, there are two very important anchoring concepts which have remained the same and which cause me serious concern. The first of these is the literature's portrayal of Native children. There has been an almost fanatical adherence to certain cultural characteristics understood as "Native" in this literature. In Native education, "Native" continues to mean that *all* Native individuals adhere to certain beliefs and practices and behave in certain ways which in turn affect their ability to learn. Elofson (1987:32) provides a good example of this particular type of representation when she asserts,

> Most middle class children are introduced to the skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic at home before they ever attend school...Most Indian children receive no such preschool training. Their early education consists of learning the skills of traditional Indian society. While other children learn to read and write they go hunting, camping and fishing.

It is a cultural representation which concerns me. It concerns me because it argues that *all* Native students, whether they have grown up in the city, in the country, on a reserve, in British Columbia or Newfoundland, hold specific cultural "differences" which directly impact on their ability to learn in Western classrooms.

The second concept that remains embedded in general Native educational literature is one that views the educational system itself as a neutral vehicle for achieving functional ends. Oakes (1988:41) presents us with an example of this concept of educational neutrality when she asks the question, "If the primary purpose of education is to provide students with modern job related skills, do cultural courses have a place in present-day classrooms?" Oakes assumes that the classroom is not a cultural site, splitting Native culture and Western classrooms into a dichotomy which writes classrooms as impartial rather than contextualized or saturated in Euro-Canadian culture.

Inside "Information": Personal Experiences with Cultural "Difference" and Schooling

For a number of personal reasons these two aspects of Native educational literature bother me. Circumstance, experience and knowledge have shaped my life in ways that have formed my perspective on the world and my place within it. I also believe that in the academic realm, it is important to identify and speak to the experiences and knowledge that have shaped the way we read and write the world for ourselves and for those who read us. For me, this serves two important purposes. First, it provides a map for the reader of the place from which I write. Second, it is a constant reminder to myself not to assume that what I write constitutes any form of uncontestable truth. Rather it is a window to the place in which I find myself and is "true" only in so far as it reflects my current understanding of the particular world that I have been living in for the past twenty years.

There are three specific reasons why I chose to immerse myself in Canadian Native educational academic discourse.[2] The impetus behind this dissertation comes from my experiences as a mother to children who are Native and who claim First Nation(s) identity. I have been driven by a need to know why I could not, in any satisfactory way, make sense of some of my children's educational experiences. Being "white" I had never encountered the type of educational reality they were subjected to. What I did know was that my children were being adversely affected by educational experiences and knowledge that were both destructive and exclusionary - I have wiped the tears flowing down my children's faces after they have been physically or emotionally beaten up at school because they were perceived as "different", this difference apparently justifying the treatment they received.

---

[2] While I will not be qualifying Native educational discourse with "Canadian" or "academic" throughout this dissertation, that is the discursive focus of this study.

In an educational system designed to instill the kind of social and academic experiences necessary for children to become competent, confident adults, I have sat in classrooms where my children have been "taught" about themselves. I have seen the look of realization that crossed their small faces when they became aware that because they were Native they were perceived as "different" - this "difference" often separating them in dubious ways from their classmates. Buffaloes, teepees, beaded moccasins, head bands, singing "One little, two little, three little Indians" and names like Running Bear and Little Star defined the classroom knowledge about who they were.

I have watched as they valiantly struggled to make sense of how they were being assembled by others. In trying to cope with the notions of identity projected onto them by others, I have watched as they rejected both their father and me in turn and ultimately rejected themselves. I have been angered, frustrated and at times hopelessly overwhelmed by the stock nature of the "cultural" knowledge taught to my children and the detrimental experiences this knowledge has engendered. This dissertation is my way of trying to make their world a better, safer place.

The location from which I write has also been shaped by my experiences as a teacher. It has been both different and the same as the educational experiences of my own children. I have worked in reserve schools where the student population was composed solely of First Nation(s) children. As a teacher, I often observed how it was the same standardized "type" of cultural knowledge that my children were being taught, which was used by the teachers in this school to construct the student's cultural identity. However, because all the students were of First Nation(s) ancestry, this formulaic knowledge of what constituted cultural "difference" became the cornerstone from which to explain everything that was happening in the classrooms.

In the schools where I taught, Native students often struggled both academically and socially. Their struggle was often attributed to their cultural "difference". It was commonly asserted that the children and their community used time differently -they missed school because of traditional seasonal activities. They learned differently - theirs was a cooperative society -they didn't compete. They had different priorities - they were interested in hunting, tanning, beading rather than going to school. They were better at right brain tasks - painting murals on the walls was a more productive task than learning to read and so on and so forth.

This rationalization was one that assumed that the inability of Native students to meet social and academic expectations of the educational system was a result of the children's different "culture" rather than because of the dominant education system's perception about what constituted Native culture. However, as Ruth Parry (1978:1) comments "... most of us have in our consciousness an inherited historical ideology to explain so-called Native inferiority which accounts for and rationalizes the poor school performance of Native children, thus letting teachers 'off the hook'". Moreover, these particular stereotypical notions of "difference" were linked to curriculum and pedagogical practices that had disastrous consequences for the cultural identity and education of these children. From my perspective, these children were subjected to educational and cultural abuse.

Finally, I write from a perspective that has been formed, in part, through an immersion in the academic Native educational discourse. I have spent the last five years reading and researching many "different aspects" of Native education. I have studied community development and education, school organizational dynamics, teachers and Native education and cross-cultural educational theory and research. I immersed myself in this literature in order to try and make some sense out of my experiences as a teacher and the educational experiences of my children. This was not to be. Answers to why and how the cultural identity of First Nation(s) children (my own included) were perpetually constructed and interpreted using naive and one-dimensional notions of culture were not to be found in the literature. Instead, there was a general consensus in this literature about what constituted First Nation(s) cultural "difference". This led me to wonder whether these particular perceptions of cultural "difference" embedded in the "common sense" knowledge about First Nation(s) societies and people were in some way generated by Native educational discourse.

This is not to suggest that it is only from this specific field of literature that non-native children, teachers and researchers acquire this "type" of cultural knowledge "about" First Nations(s) peoples. In fact, it probably contributes no more than a minor portion of the knowledge Canadian society has about Native peoples. The larger Canadian social milieu carries within it "common sense" knowledge about "Indians" that I'm sure can be garnered without ever having read a single text from Native educational literature. The Noble Warrior /Menacing Savage, the Indian Princess/Dirty Squaw, the Impoverished Indian helpless in his pathological inability to adapt to the modern world / Militant Indian, bitter and obsessed with disrupting the natural order of things are but a few of the common stereotypes that come to mind.

Nevertheless, I decided to make the assumption that this particular body of Native educational literature knowledge (which embodies the discourse of Native education) plays a role in the dissemination or is a reflection of this type of representational knowledge, perhaps as one of the larger discourses that are drawn upon in the creation of textbooks used in classrooms or to educate teachers about First Nation(s) peoples.

As Bourdieu (1990:53) argues,

> What we consider to be social reality is to a great extent representation or the product of representation, in all senses of the term...In the case of the social world, speaking with authority is as good as doing: if for instance I say with authority that social classes exist, I contribute greatly to making them exist.

"Inside" Information: Culture, Education and the Myth of Equality of Opportunity

Linked with my concerns about the cultural representations subscribed to in Native educational literature are my equally strong reservations about the educational model this discourse embraces. Central to this model is the doctrine of "equality of opportunity". It is an educational model which argues that schooling provides equal opportunities for all individuals to achieve whatever position in society they desire dependent only on their abilities and motivation. Although it is stated in many different ways, "equality of opportunity" boils down to the belief that, "in Canada children, regardless of their class origin, sex, religion, ethnicity or physical location, can be given an equal opportunity to make the greatest possible use of their talents in school at all levels. It is further assumed, if not overtly stated, that it is the educational institution over all others that has the greatest possibility to alleviate social inequalities" (Young,1993:24).

It is a doctrine that does not hold true. Schools have not been successful as vehicles of mobility for children of lower class positions or as agents of social change regardless of the child's ability and motivation. Studies done in Canada on the "equality of opportunity" model of education point out that the relationship between social class origins and economic status has been virtually unchanged throughout the twentieth century. Inequalities which exist are by and large reproduced in the next generation by the educational system: " Equality of opportunity in Canada is more myth than real" (Richer,1982:346).

In Native educational discourse it is the "equality of opportunity" objective which underlies a substantial part of educational theory and pedagogies advocated in this discourse. This model of education is based on liberal educational ideology, an ideology which states that the way to rectify social and economic problems is to provide more educational opportunities for those who exist outside the mainstream. It is an educational position based on the liberal "belief" that "freedom is increased through the social provision of more educational opportunities" (Rockhill,1993:162). What the pre-dominant Native educational literature consistently overlooks is that by accepting this liberal ideology which drives the "equality of opportunity" argument in education, it interprets education as a neutral venue and so "decontextualizes and splits apart the learner from what is to be learned, as well as from the forms and structures through which 'it' is provided" (Rockhill,1993:162). It is a position that fails to consider that the obvious "inequalities" that currently exist for Native people might be reproduced by the philosophy and practices of education system itself.

Instead, "equality of opportunity" educational ideology locates the source of educational and social problems not in the educational system but primarily in the failings and shortcomings of individuals and social groups. In determining the relationship between Native students and the educational system, explanation is often based on the assumption that the "fault" lies with the cultural incommensurability of the "other". Put another way, the limited cultural representational knowledge of Native students is translated into the reason they have difficulty in creating and sustaining a successful relationship with the educational system. In doing so this cultural representation splits Native and Euro-Canadian into monolithic entities, ignoring the long relationship between the two. It constructs Native education in ways which suggest that "indigenous communities have to fully assimilate or resist, that is accept Western schooling as is or be isolated within a 'traditional' indigenous framework" (Mohatt 1994:182).

In reading the problem as the cultural incompatibility of Native students, "equality of opportunity" theory fails to question the epistemology of "difference" upon which it is based. It neglects to ask what the very idea of "difference" signifies in asymmetrical social relations, how "difference" is socially produced and reproduced, and/or whether the "differences" in question are indeed responsible for the inequalities that occur. This absence in the literature bears serious consideration. In failing to ask about the ways "difference" has been constructed, conclusions are drawn in Native educational literature about First Nation(s) ways of knowing that neglect to draw attention to the politics of knowing insofar as it is organized to reflect Euro-experience and hence to entrench Euro-centric power and authority. Instead, as Rockhill (1993:162) observes, quite the opposite occurs, "as lived differences and the practices that give rise to them are concealed and sealed behind conceptions that mask, categorize and mark". In essence, "equality of opportunity" neglects to take into account how "inequality" might be socially constructed or reproduced and lived in the power relations of everyday life.

Given these two concerns about the Native educational literature; the underlying frameworks that contextualize and couple Native culture and Western education, I felt it might be possible to gain some answers to what I still did not understand by asking what was involved in producing a body of knowledge that continually inscribes certain types of cultural characteristics onto First Nation(s) individuals and then links this particular cultural identification with the "equality of opportunity" educational model. What I am suggesting is that Native educational discourse has created for itself a certain representation of the culture it claims to demarcate. It is this representation coupled with the "equality of opportunity" ideology found in broad educational theory and which Native educational literature utilizes, that determines the boundaries of the discourse in the educational discussion.

Urion (1991:1), one of the few critics of Native educational discourse, writes,

> One constant in this literature [Native education] is that there seems to have always been an assumption that the discussion must be founded on an accurate definition of the characteristics of First Nations peoples, so quite a bit of this literature attempts to describe Indians in connection with an implicit formal educational goal.

Given this claim, what I have attempted to do in this work is to investigate the relationship between a particular discursive construction of First Nation(s) cultural "difference" and the Euro-Canadian educational philosophy adhered to in this discourse.

This study directs its focus to an investigation of the academic body of knowledge known as Native education. It does so in order to investigate why and how this literature continues to link specific cultural representations of First Nation(s) peoples with the equality of opportunity model of education.

Counterpoint

It is also a study whose focus is framed by the idea of counterpoint.[3] Counterpoint is a concept I have found invaluable in laying out my analysis of Native educational literature. A notion most often used in music, counterpoint is a term used to define the juxtaposition and joining of two melodies within a piece of music. In counterpoint, two distinct yet utterly enmeshed melodies build upon each other within a basic framework. As melodies, their relation to each other may be discordant or harmonious, convergent or separated, resistant or acquiescent - but a fluid relationship always, already developing, changing directions, growing, producing new multiple sounds and combinations of sounds that are nevertheless intimately determined by their relationship to each other.

---

[3] There a number of important "points" to be made regarding the use of this concept in the analysis that follows. First is the distinction to be made between the words "counterpoint" and "counter points". Counterpoint is a specific type of musical form which provides the structure for a piece of music. In the counterpoint form there are at least two "lines" of a musical score which interact with each other in various combinations of tonality and produce a general theme of musicality. "Points" and "counter points" are the notes used to construct the first and second "lines" in the "counterpoint" musical form. It is important to this study to have a working definition of these terms since we often use the word "counter" in the adversarial sense; as disconnected , conflictual and diametrically opposed to whatever stance or idea is being put forth. I do not evoke the term "counterpoint" or "counter points" within this oppositional definition of the word "counter" for it is a definition that while

> The chief objective of counterpoint study...is to awaken or sharpen in students a feeling for the contrapuntal element that is present to some degree in virtually all music; to make them sensitive to the forces of opposition and agreement, tension and relaxation, direction, climax, and the like that operate whenever two or more voices are sounded simultaneously (Kennan,1987:vii).

For me, counterpoint is a concept that suggests connection, growth, variation and change rather than the concepts of separation, stagnation, invariability and permanency now present in most of the Native educational literature. Counterpoint is a concept that insists on the idea of interactive, developing relationship. It implies that there is more to the Native/White coupling than the asymmetrical action/reaction scenario so often expounded in this educational literature.

Counterpoint has also helped me to understand the way I think. The impossibility of my conceptual frameworks have become more obvious to me, and it has become easier to conceptualize, in a concrete sense, how the governing cultural and

---

acknowledging tension and dissonance, ignores development, consensus or relationship. Quite the contrary, the oppositional meaning embedded in the common use of the word "counter" invokes the very thing I try to avoid in terms of understanding this discourse; dualities based on action/reaction, domination/subjugation, civilized/primitive, knowledge/ignorance. Rather, I use the terms "counterpoint" and "counter points" as the means to contextualize and make sense of these artificial divisions and to investigate the relationship between them.

educational frameworks in Native educational discourse have been demarcated upon artificially separated lines that are actually intimately intertwined. Accordingly, this dissertation is framed by the idea of counterpoint. In it you will find theoretical, methodological, cultural and educational discussions based on this idea of counterpoint; discussions that center around the relationship between "Native"/"Euro-Canadian" and formal schooling in Native educational discourse.

Chapter Two for instance, lays out the "counterpoint" theory I have taken up to help me answer my questions. These theoretical concepts include critical ideology theory, postmodern/structural approaches to knowledge construction and critical pedagogies, all of which investigate discursively constructed relationships. The chapter begins with a look at the critical theories of ideology I have drawn on to deconstruct Native educational literature and my reasons for doing so. I then discuss some of the current work being done in postmodernist discourses; particularly some of the theoretical concepts which specifically address the relationship between those who know and those who are known. In this discussion, I lay out some of the important underlying principles that differentiate modern and postmodern approaches to knowledge construction. Finally, I draw on the discourse of critical pedagogies, briefly highlighting the key conceptual differences between modernist and critical pedagogies.

Chapter Three offers a discussion of the methodological concepts I utilize to undertake this discursive analysis of Native educational literature. To unweave the fabric of Native educational text I once again turn to postmodern/structural discourse. I do so as these discourses, in striving to undermine and displace the frameworks upon which the West's knowledge has been built, have constructed some useful methodological tools from which to approach textual analysis. These include an insistence on critically questioning the authority of those who write the text and the relationship between those who write and those who are reading. This is followed by a discussion on the discursive methods of analysis developed by Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault, both whom in their own ways, also take up "counterpoint" to interrogate and expose the impossibility of the frameworks utilized by the modernist social discourses in their construction of knowledge.

Chapter Four begins my investigation into the questions that directed me towards this research. In that chapter I look at some of the reasons my children, and others identified as "Native", are consistently reduced to a one-dimensional stereotyped identity in the general Native educational literature. The chapter includes a detailed discussion of cultural determinism; the central premise which underlies the prevailing discourse in Native education. I then investigate the relationship between cultural determinism and the specific educational theories and practices it engenders.

Chapter Five takes a look at how cultural determinist ideology continues to be reproduced in much of the Native educational literature even though the discourse has recently taken up postmodern theory - a discourse specifically directed at dismantling and undermining the artificial ways in which knowledge about the "other" is socially constructed. To do so, that chapter offers two current articles in Native educational literature which, despite having taken up postmodern theory, reproduce and join a modernist monolithic construction of Native cultural identity with "equality of opportunity" educational doctrine.

Chapter Six traces the history of the cultural determinist concept that underlies the predominant Native educational discourse, unveiling its origins in 18th century imperialism and Darwinism. Chapter Seven explores some alternative cultural and educational theoretical "counter points" that have grown out of, and in response to modernist positions, and which might be of greater benefit to Native educational discourse. It also looks at ways critical pedagogies might be practiced in classrooms. Finally, Chapter Seven offers some suggestions on self-reflexivity and ethical responsibility for Euro-Canadians who write in this field.

Chapter Two

Theoretical Counterpoint

> ***"Oh no!" says Coyote. "Not again."***
> ***"Sure", I says. "What did you expect was going to happen?"***
> ***"How many times do we have to do this?" says Coyote.***
> ***"Until we get it right," I says.*** (Thomas King, 1993:194)

Markand Thakur (1990: xii) writes: "Counterpoint is the conjunction of lines; the study of counterpoint is the study of line and of lines joining". My purpose in this chapter is to highlight the theoretical concepts I have used to study the modernist theoretical "point line" in Native educational discourse. As concepts, the theoretical constructs I have taken up are engaged with the "counterpoint" notion on two accounts. First, as theoretical perspectives, they are all "counterpoint" theoretical "lines" interested in the study of modernist theoretical "lines" . Second, the theoretical constructs that I have taken up in this study can themselves be framed by the concept of counterpoint. As theories, they are often considered separate from the modernist "lines" which they are concerned with analyzing and dismantling, e.g., postmodern versus modern, poststructural versus structural, neutral ideology versus critical ideology, traditional pedagogy versus critical pedagogy. However it is important to remember that as theoretical counterpoint "lines", they are connected in any number of ways to the modernist "line" that they seek to uncover. As such they are "joined" to the very "lines" they seek to expose and reconfigure. In short, these "counterpoint" theoretical "lines" must be approached with caution for they often carry within them the very theme of the modernist "line" that they attempt to rewrite.

This chapter begins with a discussion of critical ideology theory, outlining its relevance to my analysis and detailing the concepts of discourse and ideology that I have drawn upon to guide me in this critique. This is followed by a discussion directed towards the social production of knowledge, specifically postmodern and poststructural discourses. I have drawn on these two discourses since their focus is *not* on how best to "identify" difference but to unravel what purposes this demarcation has and show how it is related to power in asymmetrical relations. I have taken what I view as certain key concepts from postmodern and poststructural theory to help me uncover and analyze the modernist theories of social construction of knowledge embedded in Native educational discourse.

In conjunction with postmodern and poststructural theory, I have utilized some of the divergent pedagogical positions found in current educational theory and practice. These include critical pedadogy and critical feminist pedagogy. Both of these pedagogies take up some aspects of postmodern and poststructural theory and incorporate it to their pedagogical domains. Like the postmodern/structural fields, these pedagogical theories challenge the foundation on which traditional pedagogies have been built, questioning the role traditional pedagogies play in establishing and maintaining the legitimacy and power of "equality of opportunity" educational ideology. These critical pedagogies also suggest ways of reconfiguring knowledge, authority and power relationships in the classroom. It is a chapter whose overall intent is to offer theoretical "counter pionts" that might prove helpful in understanding the composition of the cultural/educational theories currently used in Native educational discourse.

Theoretical Choices

The academic world revolves around theory, argument and interpretation, and the discourse of Native education is no exception. However, in my past research I felt that I had always entered into the debate in ways that did nothing to help rethink or advance the research that was being produced in this area. Although I was dissatisfied, I had no idea how to write about cultural "differences" and schooling without simply repeating tired old clichés. It was the writing of Anne Louise Brookes (1992) that not only suggested why I was unhappy with the work I had been doing but also why I still did not understand in any satisfactory way what was happening to my children or to others typed as "Indian".

I found Brookes insightful because she writes of her struggle to find her own voice in the academic world. Initially concentrating her energies on battered women, she comes to the realization that no matter how she tries to write or analyze the experiences of this group, she continues to objectify their realities and experiences as if they were specimens in a laboratory: "Each attempt to research and write differently brought me back to the fact that I, or someone else, was describing the realities of others from our own perspective" (Brookes,1992:11). This was exactly what I had been doing in my research; writing about "others" from a place both removed and distant. I was simply doing what most others who wrote in the area of Native education were doing - writing about the "Indians".

But what about my own location? Why had I never questioned this before? Why had I been blind to the simple reality that I was one of those who wrote about "others" without considering the place from which I wrote? What role did I play simply by being a member of the larger "White" society in the production of the regimented construction of "Native cultures" and the exclusion it engendered in the literature? Moreover, as a member of Euro-Canadian society how did I manage to make myself invisible in the relationship between Native peoples and Euro-Canadian education? Brookes (1992) had an answer to those questions as well. She argues that we never question or theorize our own social construction of identity and place because we have never been taught to do so.

> Something important happened to me this year in a class concerned with the social organization of knowledge. I began to see how knowledge is organized by social practices which can render invisible ideological boundaries...In analyzing this process at work in my own writing, I am better able to understand what it means to speak of socially-produced knowledge (1992:4).

What this suggested to me was that perhaps it was important for me to try and understand the ways I had been taught to "see" people and schooling in certain ways. It seemed to me that most of us who contributed to the area of Native educational literature consistently failed to question the general themes the literature had been built upon, the logic of its arguments, or the context in which these had been produced.

At the intersection of education and cultural "differences" in Native education, "common sense" notions of Native cultural "differences" or "education" were rarely challenged or taken to be problematic. It might be that the general unreflective and uncritical posture in Native educational discourse came from its neglect in examining the place from which it wrote or how this location was tied to power. Instead of focusing on Native cultural "differences", I decided it would be more fruitful to investigate the Euro-Canadian philosophical and theoretical frameworks that held the literature together.

Taking up Brookes's suggestions on how to approach theory and method, I decided I would not direct my attention to First Nation(s) culture but instead focus on my own "White" culture. I was beginning to understand that my perceptions of First Nation(s) cultural identities along with my understanding about education were anchored onto certain beliefs and assumptions. I was also beginning to "see" how my position and perception were linked in ways which provided me with the power to authorize and use knowledge in certain ways. I decided I would try to understand not just how, but why my own culture had organized my perception on these issues.

It was for these reasons that I decided to take up critical ideology theory. This theoretical approach is one that explores the specific ways knowledge is constructed through certain organizational strategies and the purposes these particular knowledge constructions serve in a broader context. Dorothy Smith (1974:41) writes: "To think ideologically is therefore to think in a distinctive and describable way". What she argues is that it is the framework which we use to filter our ideas that is ideological in the construction of knowledge. These ideologies are the structuring templates which we use to construct and organize our ideas about people and their circumstances.

Let me give you an example. In Native educational literature, one of the "cultural" cornerstones lies in the belief that the learning style of Native students is different from Euro-Canadian students. For example, Jane Foreman's (1993) article, "Questioning Power Structures and Competitiveness in Pedagogy -Insights from North American Indian and Philippine Pedagogies" makes the claim that in Native education, "content and activities are not imposed but elicited/offered, questions have no right/wrong answers, leadership is shared and the child is expected to be a self-evaluating autonomous learner" (564-568). More importantly, she interprets this "difference" as one of the major reasons Native students do not do well in school. Foreman's objective in this article is to "demonstrate how popular theatre can play a major role in democratizing the provision of education and in encouraging *educational development in circumstances where other approaches have been ineffectual*" (1993:561, emphasis added).

Of course to be marked as an inhibitor to learning , the "Native learning style" needs to be contrasted with something. This contrast comes through comparison with the learning style of the Euro-Canadian student who, in Native educational literature, apparently thrives on individual achievement, competitiveness and direct instructional techniques. One problem with this interpretation of the different learning styles of Native and Euro-Canadian students, is that Canadian classrooms do not always adhere to this type of traditional schooling practice. Canadian education is based to a large extent on an educational model known as progressive education founded on the philosophy of one of Canadian education's gurus - American John Dewey. The similarity between the Native and progressive approaches to learning are striking. The core principles found in Dewey's educational philosophy are based on the following beliefs: The child should always be treated with respect. Education should proceed through self-discovery techniques, and there should be a wholistic integration of subject areas. Children should work cooperatively and should have experiences as leaders and as followers. The teacher is a motivator rather than a distributor of knowledge and a seeker of truth along with the students (Bennet,1976).

This being the case, Native children should be thriving in classrooms. Progressive education embodies many of the learning style specifics that Native educational literature claims are necessary for successful Native classrooms. It is educational philosophy and practice which fits the "different" pedagogical needs of Native children like a glove. That progressive and Native pedagogies correspond so closely to each other raises a number of questions. If Canadian children and Native children both learn best in this type of educational environment, where is the cultural "difference" in the learning styles? Since this type of progressive schooling is practiced in Canada, why are Native children rather than Euro-Canadian children struggling in classrooms? Logically, the opposite should occur given the "differences" between the Euro-Canadian and Native students.

This is one of the ways ideologically-driven discourse works. It takes information and filters it through particular pre-established frameworks. In this case, much of the Native educational literature differentiates learning styles through previously embedded cultural and educational models to come up with an explanation for why

Native children struggle in schools. By setting the boundaries of the debate this way, the framework neatly excludes exploring any other possibilities for what might be occurring in classrooms for Native students. As Rockhill (1993:171) comments,

> The construction of education is embedded in the discursive practices and power relationships of everyday life: It is socially constructed, materially produced, morally regulated and carries a symbolic significance which cannot be captured by its reduction to any one of these.

It is this awareness of the categories which those of us who work in the area of Native education think and the ideological terrain that lies beneath these categories that I hope through this work to begin exposing and dismantling.

This critique of Native educational discourse also reflects, methodologically, my concern with past and present research methods. It is a concern that comes from what I understand to be "the impossibility and political untenability of adhering to certain stances of neutrality" (Roman,1993:186). I have come to understand myself as an unwitting accomplice to the perpetration of racist ideology. By neglecting the question of power in the cultural/educational philosophical and theoretical foundations that shape Native educational literature, I have helped to mask the many ways in which the objectification of "others" mask and sustain relations of power, authority, knowledge and truth.

To investigate the ideological nature of Native educational discourse, I have critiqued a selection of texts written over last twenty five years in the area of Native education. These texts examine schools and education, students and teachers, pedagogy and curriculum. In my critique, I have tried to unravel and clarify the ideological composition and uses of knowledge, authority and power present in Native educational discourse. Specifically, in this analysis of text I have investigated how modernist "points" of "difference" and "education" create a particular overriding "theme" in Native educational literature; a theme rarely questioned or problematized.

Althusser holds that all thought is conducted within the terms of an unconscious problematic which silently underpins it. An ideological problematic is a particular organization of categories which at any given historical moment constitutes the limits of what we are able to utter and conceive. As I see it, the ideological problematic in the predominant Native educational literature lies in uncovering the reasons this literature continues to organize itself around certain concepts of culture and education.

In approaching Native educational discourse as ideological practice, it is my intention to identify key and repeated ideological claims, assumptions and goals that currently set the terms of debate in Native educational discourse. However, let me admit that it has been difficult to grasp ideology as a specific type of discourse and to appreciate how knowledge is therefore, socially constructed. As Anne Louise Brookes (1992:102) observes, "we learn so deeply to live in the realm of illusion that it is difficult for us to examine the very ideas which organize our experience" or I might add, how we organize someone else's experiences. To try to move beyond this racist approach, to explore the ways in which relations of power are ideologically constructed to produce racist discourse has been no easy task, and it is one I still struggle with. Nevertheless, it has been a worthwhile endeavour, for it has helped me to understand how racist ideological discourse has organized my perception and framed my past work in Native education.

Discourse and Ideology

The critique of ideology in discourse analysis investigates the multiple ways knowledge and authority intertwine to define a discourse. The term discourse refers to the "complex of conceptions, classifications and language use that characterize a specific sub-set of an ideological formation" (Street, 1993:15). By choosing this term, I am arguing that Native educational literature is a discourse unified by common beliefs, assumptions and theories historically ingrained about First Nation(s) cultural "differences". Moreover, as a ready way of thinking, these common assumptions have closed off diverse or alternate possibilities to theory and research in the Native educational discourse. In ideological critique, the concept of discourse is read in "terms of the real social relations between historical forces and relations on the one hand and forms of discourse sustained or undermined by them on the other" (Street,1993:16). By confining itself to certain "key" concepts and "lines" of interpretation, "a discourse may have an effect similiar to ideology: As a ready-made way of thinking, discourse can rule out alternative ways of thinking and hence preserve a particular distribution of power" (Dictionary of Sociology,1988:71).

The term "ideology" is one imbued with multiple and contradictory meanings, making its meaning exceedingly difficult to pin down or unravel. In part, the ambiguity and complexity of "ideology" is a reflection of its Enlightenment roots. Ideology was born out of the assumption that it was possible to study the origin of ideas from a scientific position of neutrality and objectivity. Its history begins with the French liberal philosopher Destutte deTracy, who argued that ideological study was a necessary prerequisite for the scientific understanding of society. Yet as John Smith (1984: 288) writes,

> such a science was not divorced from specific values and political orientation; namely to provide the theoretical and conceptual machinery necessary for the reconstruction of French society. So the term was born true to its enlightenment form, with a front garden of scientific neutrality, and with the main structure embodying a specific programme of social reform.

Since its inception, the study of ideology has branched off in a number of directions. Ideological theories range from those that utilize ideology as a conceptual tool to describe people and their worlds to a conceptualization that views ideology as a notion directly tied to power. At its most benign, ideology is defined as nothing more than,

> the belief-systems characteristic of certain social groups or classes, composed of both discursive and non-discursive elements which comes close to the notion of a 'world view' in the sense of a relatively well-systematized set of categories which provide a 'frame for the belief, perception and conduct of a body of individuals...(Guess cited in Eagleton,1991: 43).

At the other end of the theoretical spectrum, is a conceptualization of ideology that links ideology to relations of repression and domination. This conceptualization challenges the apparently impartial definition of ideology, coupling it to critique and power. The term ideology in the critical sense then, makes reference not only to belief systems but to questions of power. This negative use of the term writes Thompson (1984:5) "expresses what may be called a critical conception of ideology. It preserves the negative connotation which has been conveyed by the term throughout most of its history and it binds the analysis of ideology to the question of critique".

Historically, it was Karl Marx who was perhaps most instrumental in constructing the theoretical "counterpoint" of ideology when he began to theorize ideologies as systems of representations which mark not just *one* relationship set but *two*. "While the first system of representation is real, it also hides another set of relations between people which are no less real" (Sharp,1980:90). A society cannot exist, suggested Marx, without forging a representation of its unity. However, even as this unity is attested to by the interdependence of individuals in the society, it is threatened by the separation of their socio/economic activities. Ideology, Marx claimed, provided the means to, "portray 'real' distinctions of social division as 'natural', the particular to be disguised in the universal and the historical to be effaced in the temporality of essence" (Thompson,1984:25). In other words, Marx argued that while the social relations in a society are often unequal, they are cast as natural, fair and immutable. This representation of social relations justifies the particular location of individuals and groups and stabilizes and legitimates the social hierarchy.

To investigate the ideological composition of Native educational discourse, I have drawn on critical ideology theory. It is theory that offers a position developed within the theoretical counterpoint of ideology; one which responds to the neutral theory of ideology on two grounds. The first challenge critical ideology theory makes is that the neutral definition of ideology ignores the *social relationships* between different groups of people, casting particular groups in a *determined* and *isolated* manner and neglecting the diversity of relationships both inside and outside the group. The second challenge comes from critical ideology theory's understanding that the way in which knowledge of particular groups is constructed is intimately connected to power and authority. Critical ideology theory claims that a discourse driven by ideology is one powered by meaning and bound up with the legitimation and domination of certain interests. Critical ideology theory argues that *rather than thinking within our assumptions, it is necessary to think about our assumptions, the frameworks upon which they have been constructed and the broader implications of these constructions.*

Critical ideology theory is used in discursive analysis as a general strategy for focusing on questions of power, knowledge, and historical genesis in discourses. The objective of this type of analysis is to unravel how ideologically constituted discourses operate to preserve and justify mandated courses of action. It is analysis that maps the ways which power and meaning intersect with each other in the contextualization and construction of knowledge. The French philosopher Paul Ricoeur refers to this process as "distanciation", a process that challenges taken-for-granted assumptions and in doing so offers the possibility of cognitive transformation: "The power of the text to open a dimension of reality implies in principle a recourse against any given reality and thereby the possibility of critique of the real" (1983:93). Ideologically speaking, "distanciation" provides the theoretical means to make the shift from Native to Euro-Canadian in ways that demonstrate that as individual subjects we are not the sole source or even the most important source of our own thought:

> Any cognitive thought whatever, even one in my consciousness, in my psyche, comes into existence as we have said, within an ideological system of knowledge where that thought will find its place (Volosinov,1973:35).

Discursive ideological analysis has mapped asymmetrical relations of power in a number of ways. The extensive work done in the study of ideology and discourse has provided theorists and critics with enough material for the production of thousands of books, articles and theses. Given the range and extent of material, I have had to make a choice about what critical ideological theory would best help me search out the ideological character of Native education. In mapping the ideological terrain that shapes Native educational discourse, I have chosen to make use of John Thompson's claim that ideology has to do with legitimating the power of a dominant social group or class in a stratified society. He writes: "To study ideology is to study the ways in which meaning (signification) serves to sustain relations of domination" (1984:40). Using this definition of ideology to critique the governing Native educational literature has allowed me to ask questions about cultural "difference" and "education" in a different way. First, I have been able to ask what using particular configurations of culture actually mean to the stabilization of the present relationship between Euro-Canadian education and First Nation(s) societies. To use Thompson's specific conceptualization of ideology has allowed me to contextualize Native educational discourse in a way that explicates the relation between power/domination and action/structure.[1] It does so by providing space for questioning how the dominant cultural/educational theories ascribed to within Native educational literature, perpetuate and support the underlying power relations located in the discourse.

While there are a multitude of ways in which ideology operates to shape and inform a discourse, Thompson (1984:131) defines three operations as central. In the first instance, relations of domination may be represented as legitimate by promoting beliefs and values well suited to itself. Legitimation promotes these beliefs and values by naturalizing and universalizing such beliefs so as to render them as self-evident and inevitable and by excluding rival forms of thought.

A second way in which ideology operates is by means of dissimulation. Relations of domination which serve the interests of some at the expense of others may be concealed, denied or blocked in various ways, often presenting themselves as something other than what they are. Mystification as it is commonly known, "frequently takes the form of masking or suppressing social conflicts, from which arises the conception of ideology as an imaginary resolution of real contradictions" (Eagleton,1991:5).

Finally, ideology encourages reification by representing a transitory, historical state of affairs as if it were outside of time. It assumes as given the effects of past actions and values, and is unconcerned with how groups came to assume their identity and how values came to be attached to this group. Put another way, ideological discourse has the ability to represent a society as ahistorical by linking together representations which act to constantly re-write society as always in the present. Ideologies as it were, suppress the historical relativity of their own doctrines.

---

[1] Thompson (1984:4) argues "that in order to clarify the nature of such a study, we must provide a cogent analysis of power and domination within the context of an account of the relations between action, institutions and social structure".

> 'Ideology' announces Althusser 'has no outside'. An ideology is reluctant to believe that is was ever born, since to do so is to acknowledge that it can die. Like the oedipal child, it would prefer to think of itself as without parentage, sprung parthenogenetically from its own seed... To view an ideology from the outside is to recognize its limits; but from the inside these boundaries vanish into infinity (Eagleton,1991:57).

The ahistoricity of ideologies allows a tacit denial that ideas and beliefs are specific to a particular time, place and social group. It detaches them from history and makes ideologies appear as if they were natural phenomena.

Second, I have been able to ask what these discursive constructions about Native cultural "difference" might really mean when Native educational literature writes about cultural "difference", its relation to Euro-Canadian education and how this particular interpretation is tied to power, knowledge and authority. If as Thompson claims, meaning serves to support domination, then there are strong grounds for investigating the discourse through a critical questioning of its claims to knowledge that are held to be absolute, monolithic and true. To unravel the ways in which cultural "difference" has been constructed in Native educational discourse, I draw on Raymond Guess and his notion of *pejorative ideology*. Guess (1981:13) defines pejorative ideology as,

> a set of values, meanings and beliefs which is to be viewed critically or negatively for any of the following reasons. True or false, these beliefs are sustained by the (conscious or unconscious) motivation of propping up an oppressive form of power. Ideology in this sense means ideas contaminated at root, genetically flawed.

Within the context of Native educational literature, Guess's ideological notion of "genetically flawed" ideas has suggested to me that a fruitful area for investigation lies in questioning whether cultural "difference" knowledge in this discourse has been constructed out of initial ideas and beliefs that are inherently defective. As such, I take up Thompson and Guess's conceptual frameworks as places from which to investigate how the prevailing discourse in Native education is ideologically constructed in ways that suit Euro-Canadian purposes rather than something that represents reality.

However, to understand how knowledge is ideologically constructed has required me to first gain some understanding of the general nature of knowledge production. In what follows, I discuss the two philosophical perspectives central to this area of study and look at some of the implications for the production of knowledge in the Native educational discourse.

The Production of Knowledge - Modern/Postmodern/Poststructural Theory

The study of the social production of knowledge is an area that has been growing rapidly in Western academic circles. This is particularly the case in areas of study known as postmodernism and poststructuralism; discourses defined by their challenge to the very foundations of knowledge that the West has assembled to organize and explain its world. Postmodern and poststructural discourses question whether the production of knowledge can be neutral and objective and what purposes knowledge actually serves. Their primary task has been to disassemble the philosophical and theoretical frameworks upon which Western thought rests. As such, I take up these two theoretical "counter points" to analyze knowledge construction. They offer the theoretical and methodological tools for making visible the ideologically driven constructions of First Nation(s) cultural "difference" and Euro-Canadian "education". Moreover, postmodernist and poststructuralist discourses engage in "counterpoint", seeking to dissuade us from viewing the world as a place where people and institutions can be reduced to separate, unjoined melodies. Postmodern and poststructuralist discourses have been a part of the theoretical means which I have used to identify the nagging inadequacies in the present philosophical orientations found in Native educational discourse. These discourses have given me an alternative perspective from which to "read" the intersection of First Nation(s) cultural "difference" and "education".

Modern Social Theory

Postmodern/poststructural discourses are fields of study which respond to modern social theory in the social sciences. Modernist social theory is based on philosophical reasoning that can be delineated by three basic beliefs. Morrow (1994:52) summarizes these as follows. The first is a claim that certain knowledge is possible because it can be based on neutral observation (i.e., facts). This conviction is based on the assumption that the observer can separate himself from that being observed. Second, through objectivist empirical science, it has been thought possible to determine the underlying laws which order nature and the universe. By extension, based on logic, rational thought and detached observation, it has been assumed that explanations can be universal and general. This second tenant is based on a reductionist assumption that understanding comes from explaining a whole complex phenomenon in terms of basic principles. Finally, there has been the understanding that the logic of the natural sciences should provide the primary source for meaning and should therefore be the basis for the unity of science: "It is this self-assertion of reason as the logic of science that has become essential to modernity, and grants epistemic warrant to scientific discourse as the dominant and legitimate form of knowledge" (Wong,1994:14). These general frameworks embedded in the modernist empirical approach to the production of knowledge have been central to Western society's "need" to classify, arrange, categorize and organize knowledge in neat tidy boxes. As the guiding principles in the production of knowledge, they have been deemed to create order out of chaos in order to achieve "enhanced levels of social understanding, moral progress and social happiness" (Smart 1993:91).

In its quest for understanding of and explanation of mankind and society, modernist discourse in the social sciences attempted to follow the natural science's paradigm. Modernist social sciences discourse has believed it possible, through neutral observation and rational thought, to provide general theories applicable to man and society. Legitimizing the production of these types of "master narratives" of knowledge, which were to enable the progressive development of human society, is the understanding that as a "science" it is possible for the social sciences to remain detached and untouched by political and social interests and therefore free from the influence of human values and concerns.

Postmodern and Poststructural Social Theory

Postmodern and poststructural social theory however, have questioned the modernist disposition towards knowledge production on the grounds that "the institutionalized power of scientific discourse has helped maintain hierarchical order being bestowed with the epistemic privilege to shape society by marginalizing, excluding and silencing the authority of rival discourse" (Wong,1994:21). Perhaps one of the most important implications in this change of perspective from modern to postmodern thought is that it is no longer necessary to attempt to fit the social sciences into a model based on the natural sciences. As Morrow(1994:58) writes, "this (shift) from modern to postmodern, made it possible to reconsider the nature of methodology, theorizing, causality, interpretation etc. from the perspective of the problems unique to the social sciences". In essence, this perceptual change regarding the nature of knowledge production provides an opening. By questioning the manner in which knowledge has been constructed, in acknowledging that as particular members of certain societies, we are neither neutral nor unbiased in the way we construct or read the world, it becomes possible to ask previously forbidden questions and begin focusing on the underlying assumptions that drive the social construction of knowledge. Ideologically speaking, postmodern and poststructural theoretical postures provide the means from which to investigate the implications of ideas and concepts generated from the modernist scientific model in the social sciences.

While postmodern and poststructural discourses defy brief description, I will discuss what I have taken as the most relevant concepts for unravelling the "forbidden" ideological terrain located in Native educational discourse. The first of these concepts is one which disputes the notion of stable meaning in contemporary society. Postmodern discourse critiques the totalizing theories of society and history with presumptions to objectivity, neutrality and a will to truth upon which modernist discourse has been built: "Postmodern science abandons absolute standards, universal categories, and grand theories in favor of local, contextualized, and pragmatic conceptual strategies" (Seidman,1994:207). Instead, working from the premise that there can be no absolute foundation on which knowledge can rest, in postmodern discourse there is a rejection of those aspects of the Western philosophical tradition that rely on a monolithic approach to knowledge. It opposes the use of "master narratives" or grand "themes" of knowledge which set out to define an essential human nature or to prescribe a global human destiny.

Postmodern discourse challenges these grand narratives by interrogating the underlying values, beliefs and assumptions embedded in the theories and methodologies upon which modernist philosophy rests. This attempt to destabilize master narratives is "synonymous with an attack on those forms of theoretical terrorism that deny contingency, values, struggle, and human agency" (Giroux,1991:68). The postmodern critique of these master narratives is an important tool in discourse analysis, for it creates an awareness of how modernist philosophy has given history, society, and human relations an ultimate and unproblematic meaning.

One of the central focuses in postmodern discourse has been to investigate and dismantle the master narratives of knowledge that have built through the social construction of the "other". At the heart of postmodern philosophy and theory lies the possibility of articulating the concept of "difference" as more than a modernist version of cultural pluralism. Since specific notions of cultural "difference" are foundational to a great deal of the knowledge produced in Native educational discourse, I now want to consider the idea of the "other" within the context of postmodern theory.

In the Native educational discourse, it is the specific ways in which culture is contextualized as a "master narrative" and conceptualized in terms of cultural "meaning" that frame and organize the text. Bound by ideological discourse which allows only certain atrophic interpretations of cultural "difference", knowledge production in this discourse comes to act as a barrier to understanding Native cultural identities except in limited ways. It is a theoretical "line" of thought which objectifies "culture" as a thing that can be sketched out, described in general terms and applied to all those who reside within its boundaries.

One way to investigate the "agenda" that drives this modernist construction of cultural "difference" in Native educational discourse is to look at how the "other" has been constructed and interpreted through ideological frameworks. It is analysis which asks how these limited conceptual "points" of cultural "difference" originated and why they have come to be embedded in the discourse. The crucial question becomes how the prevailing discourse in Native education has come to define what is correct and what is meaningless. By investigating the ideological terrain which maps the construction of the "other", it becomes possible to understand the broader purposes for a particular coupling of First Nation(s) cultural "difference" and schooling in Native educational discourse.

To expose and dismantle this barrier, requires a shift from the modern notion of culture and its implications for "difference" to the postmodern notion of culture and "difference". The second concept that I have taken from these discourses is the poststructural insistence that there is no such "thing" as a rational or neutral individual subject position. Postmodern theory of the "individual" has been directly influenced by French poststructuralist analysis on language and discourse. Poststructuralist thought has been fundamental to postmodernism's rejection of three major Western metaphysical precepts. The first of these is the modernist assumption that language offers a transparent medium for representing an external and objective reality. Second, postmodernism adopts the poststructural position of undermining the privileged status of reason and logic as the only legitimate means of gaining access to the 'truth' about that reality. Finally, postmodern philosophy takes up the poststructuralist critique of the autonomous rational and individual subject of history and with it the idea of rationalist discourse[2] (Murphy,1993:15). Postmodern discourse argues that human understanding involves the "fusing of horizons"; that is, the merging of the perspectives of knower and known that repudiates the subject/object opposition in which modernist philosophy grounds its production of knowledge. Modernist versions of cultural "difference" in the Native educational literature separate and demarcate "Native culture" as intractably "different" from Euro-Canadian culture. What is absent from the modernist versions of cultural "difference" is an acknowledgement of the necessary counterpoint relationship essential to the construction of these "lines" of "difference" between Native and Euro-Canadian "culture".

---

[2] While the postmodern discipline has adopted many of the theoretical constructs offered by the French poststructuralists, the two disciplines differ on a number of issues. Judith Butler (cited in Murphy, 1993:18) summarizes the difference between the poststructural and postmodern "counter" positions: "There is a difference between positions of poststructuralism which claim that the [Enlightenment] subject never existed, and postmodern positions which claim that the subject once had integrity, but no longer does".

Postmodern and poststructural discourses argue that the subject/object dichotomy is an impossible one since the knower and known are intimately connected, being both one and the same. It is really a very simple counterpoint position which argues that you cannot have one "line" without the other. Coupled with this claim, postmodern and poststructural theorists argue that this artificial dichotomy is constructed upon value laden assumptions which establish a hierarchy, with one "line" in the counterpoint considered more valuable than the other. Man/woman, culture/nature and white/red are all examples of this type of relationship between the subject/object dichotomy. Man knows himself as man and superior by his juxtaposition to woman. Civilization exists and is valued because it is generally considered above nature. Euro-Canadian culture in Native educational discourse is generally the valued background against which Native culture is constructed and measured.

Central to this perspective, within a movement that has been labelled the "death of man", is the work of Michel Foucault. His proclamation of the "death of man" is an assertion that the category of the subject that was created by the modern era will fall away with the era's demise. For the social sciences this means that since knowledge is socially constructed, "these disciplines never really fit into that episteme because "man" is both subject (i.e. the source) and object of knowledge" (Hekman, 1987:74). From this subject position, that man is both the source and object of knowledge, postmodern theorists argue that the construction of knowledge has to be "engaged, perspectival, hermeneutical, and pluralistic rather than absolute, monolithic, and abstract" (Hekman,1987:67). In my critique of ideology in Native educational discourse, I see this concept as an important theoretical tool which will facilitate the dismantlement of the subject/object framework on which previous knowledge has been constructed and by doing so, allow other previously ignored counter subject positions and knowledge to become visible.

Postmodern and poststructural discourses have given me a way to "read" the composition of modernist social knowledge in Native educational discourse. They have done so by offering a perspective which understands knowledge about the 'values, beliefs, or the nature of things as expressions of particular interests; values, norms and ideals as subjective or tied to particular groups, subcultures, or traditions (Seidman, 1994:191). By extension, postmodern and poststructural theoretical "counter points" suggest the importance of rewriting the relationship between knowledge, power, and desire and to the necessity of redefining the importance of difference. In challenging dominant orientations in the social production of knowledge, postmodernist theory forces us to question the implicit and explicit emphasis inherent in these orientations. It makes us "self conscious not only of what is included in the foreground, but excluded or relegated to the background as unimportant, illegitimate or impractical" (Bernstein,1976:41).

Modernist Pedagogy

Because of my own fundamental commitment to education and schooling, I am also concerned with the pedagogical practice in Native classrooms and how it is has been ideologically constituted. In contemporary educational discourse, modernist pedagogy tends to be concerned with the act of teaching and instruction. It is a particular "line" of theory and practice which focuses on "how" to teach, not "what" is being taught, "why" it is being taught, from whose perspective or for what purpose. The "how" of this modernist pedagogical approach is often associated with specific "methods" of teaching uncontested knowledge in the classroom (Kleinfeld 1972, Rampaul 1984, Ward, Shook & Marrion 1993). Ward, Shook and Marion (1993:107) for example, suggest that given the oral tradition of education used by

Native peoples, particular types of teacher responses may be related to writing improvement for Native students. It is a "how to teach that" approach to pedagogy that ignores "what" knowledge is being used in the writing exercise or "why" the "how to" suggestion is being offered in the first place. This is a pedagogical approach bound to ideologically constituted blindness for it overlooks the context in which the knowledge is being taught, the content of the knowledge itself, and its construction of those being taught.

Critical Pedagogy

There are however, counterpoint pedagogies that have developed out of and in response to this type of modernist pedagogical philosophy. Unlike approaches to pedagogy rooted in ostensibly positivistic thought, these "critical approaches see pedagogy as constitutive of a power relationship, making power a central category of their analysis"(Gore,1993:3). For educators who take up the postmodern disenchantment with the modernist pedagogical position, one such alternative lies in the discourse of critical pedagogy. It is a discourse that adopting the postmodern theory, takes up

> ...a situational, perspectival theory of knowledge which is by definition a relational theory of knowledge... Social subjects, social theories and research are always located in specific historical, cultural and political trajectories which are always in historical relation to other trajectories, other relations of domination (Luke,1992:47).

Critical pedagogy affords the opportunity to reconstruct pedagogical practice based on emerging theoretical and methodological postmodern perspectives. These critical pedagogies offer a radically different focus from the modernist pedagogical stances generally advocated in Native educational discourse.

Critical pedagogy can be defined as that which,

> ...attends to practices of teaching/learning intended to interrupt particular historical, situated systems of oppression. Such pedagogies go by many names: Frierean, feminist, antiracist, radical empowering, liberation theology (Lather,1992:121).

Rather than focusing on specific pedagogical techniques for imparting "neutral" educational curricula, critical pedagogies work from the assumption that educational knowledge is not neutral. Their aim is to destabilize and undermine the very grounds on which knowledge is produced and legitimated.

Under the umbrella of critical pedagogy, I have chosen two "counter points" which represent two distinct, significant positions within critical pedagogical discourse. I take up Henry Giroux's as an example of one important "counter point" taken in reply to modernist pedagogical philosophy and theory. I do so as "Giroux's work has increasingly represented the practice of pedagogy as the essential vehicle for actualizing the political potential suggested by postmodern social theory"(Murphy,1993:73). The second "counter point" I have chosen is that of critical feminist discourse. It is also a discourse that grows out of and in response to modernist pedagogy but it does so from a different perspective than Giroux's. Because of the different location from which it writes, critical feminist pedagogy serves as both a "counter point" to Henry Giroux's general critical pedagogical position and as a different part of the "same critical line" that counters modernist pedagogy.

For Giroux, critical pedagogy is viewed as an eminently "political vehicle" through which anti-hegemonic pedagogical practices and curricula are provided for students and teachers so that they might engage in the critique of unjust assumptions and social practices. His approach is one that has its theoretical and political roots in "Neo-Marxism and the Critical Theory of the Frankfurt school and so emphasizes a critique (embedded within a language of possibility) of social injustices and inequities" (Gore,1993:34).

Since the 1980's, Giroux has become increasingly interested in the postmodern notion of the non-neutrality of knowledge and its relationship to school curricula. As Murphy

(1993: 82) observes, implicit within Giroux's concept of postmodern social theory is the understanding that,

> While what gets taught in public education institutions surely mirrors the political ideology of dominant culture, schools should not be understood simply as passive conduits for the transmission of cultural and social norms. Through their presentation of particular curricular discourses and epistemologies as socially legitimate, schools also function as active participants in the construction of meaning-systems which regulate relations between knowledge, significance and desire.

The intent of Giroux's approach to educational curricula and pedagogy is to explicate how educational relationships revolve around political and social constructs of power and authority. Giroux argues that what is important is to teach students to evaluate critically the knowledge they are being taught, particularly their relationship to this knowledge.

Giroux's believes that in order to develop a more adequate theory of education, it is important that contemporary educators integrate the central theoretical features of postmodernism with the modernist vision of democracy, social justice and enlightened subjects. He does so by seeking to link this modernist social agenda with the postmodern rejection of master narratives that have been created out of "impartial" foundational knowledges.

As Giroux (1991:82) writes,

> This notion of critical pedagogy is one that links schooling to the imperatives of democracy, views teachers as engaged and transformative intellectuals, and makes the notion of democratic difference central to the organization of curriculum and development of classroom practice.

However, as insightful as this approach to pedagogy is in broad terms, at the level of practice it fails on several crucial points. As such, although I take it up as a useful tool for my ideological critique I do so with the following reservations. First, Giroux directs little attention to the instructional aspects of his critical project. The assumption he makes in his work is that to "construct a political vision is to propose a pedagogy...such an assumption neglects the politics of the pedagogical form itself" (Gore,1993:36). Giroux's critical pedagogical approach then, is only of use up to a certain point. For all his valuable contributions to the discourse of critical pedagogy, he refuses to go past general abstract theorizing to explore the difficulties that arise in taking the critical pedagogical approach into the reality of the classroom. While he writes eloquently of what needs to be done, he neglects (except in the most generic terms) to discuss whether this might actually be accomplished. Elizabeth Ellsworth (1989:301) in her article, "Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering" suggests that,

> While critical pedagogy literature states implicitly or explicitly that critical pedagogy is political, there has been no sustained research that attempts to explore whether or how the practices it prescribes actually alter specific power relations outside or inside schools.

In short, a major difficulty with Giroux's critical pedagogy lies in its failure to assess critically whether or not it can bring about the desired results of de-marginalizing and empowering those who occupy marginal positions within the society.

Another serious limitation located in this approach to critical pedagogy is that there is a lack of self-reflexivity about the location from which it is written.

Unfortunately, this absence propels Giroux's critical pedagogy into a position that objectifies the "other" in much the same manner as various modernist social science discourses have done. Ironically, one of the most serious overriding problems with Giroux's critical pedagogical position may be that it dismisses and silences the voices of the "other". In writing for and about the "other", Giroux's critical pedagogy adopts the paternalistic position that he seeks to undermine; it presumes that "others" all share the same "type" of oppression, it presumes that "others" do not or cannot speak for themselves, it presumes that there is a need to raise the "other" from false consciousness and it presumes the necessity of "rescue". bell hooks (1990:151), who writes from a position of "other', writes,

> I am waiting for them to stop talking about the 'Other' to stop even describing how important it is to be able to speak about difference. It is not just important what we speak about, but how and why. Often this speech about the 'Other' is also a mask, an oppressive talk hiding gaps, absences, that space where our words would be if we were speaking, if there were silence, if we were there.

Finally, Giroux neglects to consider the historical context that surround modernist words like democracy, enlightened citizens or the underlying meaning embedded in these modernist words. Democracy and citizenship for instance were initially rights intended only for adult males who were property owners. As such, democracy and citizenship were rights bestowed only on a privileged segment of society. As Ellsworth (1989:308) so astutely observes, "Utopian moments of 'democracy/equality/justice' ... are undesirable because they are always predicated on the interests of those who are in a position to define utopian projects . Critical pedagogy that does not take into account or critically interrogate the values and beliefs used in the construction of meaning simply supports and advances the very oppression it seeks to dismantle.

Critical Feminist Pedagogy

Feminist pedagogy may provide us with the tools to address these flaws in Giroux's pedagogical discourse: first, the absence of evaluation and self-reflexivity in the practical application of his "theoretical and social" project, the particular perspective from which he represents the "other" and his neglect in examining the values he puts forth. Before I begin this discussion of critical feminist discourse, it is necessary to point out that there are also some limitations in using critical feminist theory and applying it to Native educational discourse. The most significant restriction is that critical feminist theory, until recently, has only tended to deal with gender and not with race or culture/ethnicity (with its inclusive characteristics of gender, class, socio-economic status and in the case of the First Nation(s) populations, the additional pressure of institutionalized racism).

Nevertheless, there are some relevant and constructive ideas to be drawn from critical feminist pedagogy. Drawing on this discourse can be justified if for no other reason than the critical feminist discourse has had practice exploring and articulating the experience of women as "other". This articulation of the "other" is one of theoretical and methodological strengths of critical feminist discourse. Critical feminist theorists have the "advantage" of speaking and writing from the first rather than the third person subject position. This first person location gives them a different perspective from which to draw out the complexities of oppression and resistance education.

One of the strongest focuses in critical feminist discourse centers around the issue of voice. There is an unwavering insistence in critical feminist pedagogy on the individual's right to define themselves and their reality. These theorists know from first hand experience that speaking for and about others implies a position of privilege and power. This privileged position is maintained through defining, perceiving and offering understanding through the ideological "line" of reference of those in positions of privilege. Critical feminist discourse seeks to undermine and displace such relationships of power. As Lather (1992:132) points out, "To abandon crusading rhetoric, and begin to think outside of a framework which sees the 'other' as the problem for which they are the solution, is to shift the role of critical intellectuals...".

While critical feminist discourse insists on self-advocacy, it also acknowledges the difficulty in undermining the status quo through theory and practice. This is because although critical feminist theory and practice is intended to be emancipatory, it often manages to become as dominating and oppressive as those discourses which feminist theory seeks to undermine and displace. The position that critical feminists take on theoretical and methodological self-reflexivity is a cautionary note that should not be ignored. Patti Lather (1992:121) writes that one of the essential questions that postmodernism frames is, "How do our very efforts to liberate perpetuate the relations of dominance"? It is a question rooted in the experience of having the political and social positions critical feminists represent, co-opted by the very ideologies and institutions they seek to dismantle.

The relationship between theory and practice is never as simple as we might think. This is why I have drawn on critical feminist theory. To advocate for radically different "counter point" approaches to pedagogy in the classroom does not mean that these pedagogies might not serve the same purposes as the modernist pedagogies currently practiced in our classrooms. After all, these are pedagogies that not only appeared in response to, but developed out of modernist pedagogies. Because of this, they still carry "traces" of the modernist "points" within them. Critical pedagogies, as I have shown in my discussion of Giroux, can end up supporting the very thing they are attempting to reconfigure. If researchers, theorists and teachers are not careful, there is a strong possibility that taking up critical pedagogy in the classroom will become once again an exercise in composing "others" reality for them on a modernist "line".

Despite these reservations, critical pedagogies have given me what I consider to be viable alternatives from which to rethink the pedagogical "line" in Native educational discourse. These discourses, incorporating postmodern social theory, focus on how and in whose interests knowledge is produced and reproduced and the political and social ramifications this has for Euro-Canadian/First Nation(s) in relation to educational curricula and pedagogy. These critical pegagogical approaches are useful in that they allow us to examine how knowledges and individuals are socially constructed and produced, to explore the power relations embedded in these discursive constructions, and to contemplate possibilities for change and renewal.

The object of this chapter has been to introduce the theoretical concepts that I have chosen to analyze the discourse of Native education. The lens through which I look at the literature is critical ideology theory, specifically how meaning impacts with power in a discourse. To investigate the construction of meaning in this discourse I have drawn upon the postmodern critique of master narratives and the subject/object dichotomy. I have also taken up critical pedagogical theory as a way of investigating the relationship between cultural "difference" and schooling in Native educational discourse. These counterpoint discourses comprise the theoretical framework for what follows. The next chapter looks at the specific methodological strategies I have made use of in my analysis of Native educational discourse.

Chapter Three

Methodological Counterpoint

> ***The whites told only one side.***
> ***Told it to please themselves.***
> ***Told much that is not true.***
> ***Only his own best deeds,***
> ***only the worst deeds of the Indians,***
> ***has the white man told.***
> (Yellow Wolf of the Nez Perces)

This chapter lays out the discursive methodology I draw on to critique Native educational discourse. The chapter starts off with a discussion of how I chose the texts and details the limits of this study. I then outline the concepts of academic "voice" and "active text", detailing the reasons I think these two concepts are relevant to my analysis of Native educational discourse. Finally, I discuss the discursive methodologies of Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault, outlining the significance of these methodologies to my textual analysis.

Discursive Choices

Trying to decide what Native educational literature to use in my analysis was an arduous task. I felt it would be impossible for me to provide a complete representation of the Native educational discourse given its lengthy history, and so chose to limit my analysis to Native educational literature that had appeared over the last twenty five years.

Deciding how to analyze the literature also proved to be difficult. In the beginning, I toyed with the idea of random sampling and then dismissed it, accepting

Bourdieu's (1990:243) argument against random sampling on the grounds that there are certain individuals who orchestrate a field's canon. He writes,

> If following the canon dictated by orthodox methodology, you take a random sample, you mutilate the very object you have set out to construct...There are positions in a field that admit only one occupant but command the whole structure.

Accordingly, I sought out literature from the Native educational discourse by identifying those individuals whose writings occurred most frequently in the collective Native educational discourse. I hoped this method would help me identify those most influential in the general field and examine how and where their work was located. As well, I compiled my sample by topic, trying to identify dominant authors in areas such as classroom pedagogy or curriculum.

Neither of these methods proved to be particularly effective. With the rather significant exception of Damian McShane, who writes in the area of cognitive psychology, McShane has published 25 times between 1979-1988, I could identify no dominant "players", except for Carl Urion who serves as the main critic of this discourse. Spanning a time period of twenty-five years, his voice speaks the loudest in its insistence towards reflection and critical analysis of Native educational discourse. In his general criticisms of Native educational literature, he has pointed to lack of analysis of the Euro-Canadian /Native dichotomy in terms of power, the failure to investigate the political issues which frame the use of racial or cultural categories, and the idea that there is some predictive value in description of cultural norms in an applied situation (Urion,1978:(5)4).

Instead, this discourse was made up of many different authors who contributed one or two articles or research paper. Nor could I identify individuals who held prominent positions in specific subject areas such as curriculum, schooling and pedagogy. What I found was that regardless of who was writing in what area, most tended to write from the same "position". This position embraced the idea that it was the cultural "difference" of Native students that held the key to "their" educational problems. There was only one small pocket of research done in the 1970's that stood outside this "position". These texts addressed some of the same questions that I focus on and appeared around the same time that text like the "Red Paper", was written. Urion (1978,) for instance, discussed using the concept of culture in the classroom and detailed some of the inherent problems in using a cultural concept to frame Native educational literature. He noted that "Those teachers who do appeal to the literature, either directly, themselves, or in reference to their teacher-education program, which acquaints them with a literature in intercultural education may find it inapplicable" (14). Max Hedley (1976) provided a detailed analysis of an underlying framework of acculturation that he claimed pervaded the literature. Hedley concluded that adherence in Native educational literature to the "acculturation framework has led to an inability to consider questions related to conflict, power differences, and structural change" (8). Ruth Parry (1978:2) discussed the problems of stigmatization and stereotyping Native children in the classroom: "Already then on the first day of school the native child is likely to face a social pathology-based ideology about his behavior and intelligence, an assumption of linguistic, social and cognitive deficit which must be remedied if the child is to succeed. Decore, Carney and Urion (1982:21) studied Indian stereotypes in the curriculum and concluded that the material was so limited and repetitious that non-Native students had no choice but to perceive all Indian groups to be the same.

Overall however, random sampling in Bourdieu's sense of the word did not cause the problems that Bourdieu outlines, because it was the position rather than the occupant that commanded the field. Given the extent to which this core position dictated the discourse, I decided to choose text that exemplified what I saw as the general discursive subject position and to investigate the production of a "collective work of construction of social reality" (Bourdieu,1992:239).

In choosing the texts, I delimited Native educational discourse within the following boundaries. First, the discourse analysis is bounded by the identifier "Canadian" which limits the scope of this study in a number of ways. In selecting only "Canadian" material, I excluded a great deal of literature that could be identified as falling under the rubric of Native educational discourse, including the American literature. However, I justify this exclusion on the premise that much of American Native educational literature falls within the boundaries of "ethnic minority" education, an area of study which in some ways is substantially different than that of Native education. Urion(1995:174) comments on this "ethnic minority" approach to Native education in the American literature:

> This perspective surely obscures some of the issues, in that there are not only historic and legal differences between the groups, but qualitatively different life experiences that one would expect to see reflected even in a generalizing literature about Indian higher education.

Second, inside the boundary of "Canadian", I chose to restrict my focus to discourse that specifically addresses Native and education. The limitation of this move is that I neglect other discourses outside the field that also address issues of cultural "difference" and education. Among these I include anthropology and sociology. However, I defend this restriction in that I am primarily concerned with critiquing the literature that explicitly constructs itself as "Native educational" discourse.

Finally I delimit this discourse within the proviso of "academic". This study will not concern itself with literature outside the domain of "academic" that attempts to "write" about Native education. This literature includes both curriculum material and textbooks. I have imposed this boundary because I think as academics, we need to understand the ways in which we are implicated in the construction of knowledge.

The Question of Voice

The authoritative position of academic discourse brings me back once again to the postmodern issue of voice. One of the first principles in the postmodern investigation of knowledge construction involves a recognition that "those whose business it is to provide an 'expert' (objective, impartial) authoritative commentary on the social world's events are frequently important purveyors of 'ideology' " (Sharp,1980:4). By extension, if "the academic community represents "privileged" status holders whose texts are consumed by teachers and other researchers"(Gore,1993:17), then the academic community has a substantial amount of power in shaping and organizing the "lines" of perception and understanding available about the "other" through its production of discourse.

> Language is not only an instrument of communication or even of knowledge but also an instrument of power. One seeks not only to be understood but also to be believed, obeyed, respected, distinguished. Thus what is asserted in spoken or written discourse as well as that about which one speaks or writes *is infused with forms of power; different individuals or groups have a differential capacity to make a meaning stick* (Bourdieu,1990:96, emphasis added).

In other words, as academic discourse is often understood to bear the "truth", the claim can be made that it holds a position that significantly weights the meaning of what is said and written.

Given the nature and authoritative posture of academic discourse, one of the ways self-critique can be taken up by the Native educational academic community is to investigate its role in the production of ideology. To do so means making the conscious attempt to shed the cloak of invisibility against which others are (in)visibly constructed. By critiquing the discourse in ways that make the Native educational academic community visible, it may be possible to start unravelling how Native educational academic discourse ensures the very inequities that it endeavours to eliminate. Rather than seeing ourselves as innocent producers and collectors of knowledge, we need to start considering how we have been shaped by the theories and research already embedded in the discourse.[1] Gore argues that as representatives of the academic community, it is only by continually re-evaluating our own "voice" and "position" that we can provide an ethical check for the academic discourse which we produce. Gore (1993:131) suggests that attending to the "ethical" in our relationship with our work will,

> 1) keep our commitments clearly in view while helping us to see how we have excluded or oppressed others with those commitments, and 2) avoid focusing on 'Others' in ways that sustain arrogant constructions of the role of the intellectual as leader of the oppressed and means (or catalyst) of emancipation.

Constantly critiquing the Native educational discourse may contribute more to the provision of legitimate spaces for those the academic community writes about than its current insistence to focus primarily on the "other".

The Text

In conjunction with an awareness of "voice" and "position", discursive analysis must also take into consideration the role of the text in the dialogue that is set up between the academic voice and the reader. Text can be understood as "active" in the sense that it supplies a conduit from writer to reader. Put another way, texts hold within them a conceptual framework that both readers and writers need to be familiar with if the text is to make any "sense". The text itself needs to be viewed "as organizing a course of 'concerted social action', which is activated by both the writer and reader's interpretive devices relevant to the reading of a particular text" (Smith,1984:2). For instance, one conceptual framework most of us are familiar with is how women are often discursively portrayed in terms of educability. It is a conceptual "line" that "joins" certain biological ideas of intelligence with social ideas about education. For example, women are often considered more cognitively suited for an education in the arts and humanities rather than in the sciences.

---

[1] As Jennifer Gore (1993:129) argues, "the point is not to pursue the indescribable, not to reveal the hidden, not to say the nonsaid, but on the contrary, to collect the already-said, to reassemble that which one could hear or read, and this to an end which is nothing less than the constitution of oneself".

If the Native educational academic community shapes and influences the perception of teachers and other researchers, it stands to reason that the textual frameworks it uses in its production of this discourse necessarily contributes to the organization of the interpretive practices readers bring to the discourse. In Native academic educational discourse, interpretive strategies are dependent on a specific and familiar conceptual "lines" through which the information is filtered and with which both writer and reader are acquainted.

Methodological Choices

To unravel the central conceptual "line" that Native educational academic discourse is built on requires a textual methodology. For this methodology, I draw on the textual analysis methodologies of Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida. I do so as both these discursive methodologies are concerned with questions of legitimacy, voice, position and knowledge construction. They are also both engaged with the study of discursive "counterpoint". Derrida for instance, argues that textual arguments are always constructed upon a central premise grounded on two opposing terms or "point and counterpoint". Derrida's deconstructionist methodology provides the means of uncovering the central premise in a text and provides a method for demonstrating how the two terms, rather than being separate and distinct, are dependent on each other for their form and value.

Foucault points out the importance of uncovering unheard "lines" in discourses where only one "line" has been attended to in the past. For Foucault, this attention to the "lines" in a discourse, both the central lines that command a discourse and those which are ignored, is one way of investigating the relationships between power, authority and discourse. Both Derrida and Foucault offer discursive methodologies to make visible the invisible frameworks which anchor the arguments in Native education. They do so in an effort to disrupt and counter the ideological character of dominant universalistic discourses. As such they are particularly useful analytical devices for drawing out the central ideological "lines" woven into Native educational discourse.

Derrida and Deconstruction

Deconstruction is a technique that challenges the authoritative position of a text by mapping out the contradictions and inconsistencies, the absences and the lacunae which characterize the texture of a discourse. It does so by challenging and intervening in the field of hierarchical oppositional terms. These hierarchies include such notable binary terms as speech/writing, man/woman, culture/nature, and subject/object. Murphy (1993:17) writes that "as a discursive tool, it [deconstruction] is most valuable in displacing hierarchies and making the absent or suppressed present". Seeking out oppositional terms is important to my analysis, for oppositions represent a way of seeing typical of ideologies. Ideologies often draw "rigid boundaries between what is acceptable and what is not, between self and non-self, truth and falsity, sense and non-sense, reason and madness, central and marginal, surface and depth" (Sarup,1989:40). Deconstruction is a discursive methodology that provides the theoretical means to reverse classical oppositions and undermine the general placement of the discursive field.

The objective of Derridean deconstructionist methodology is to identify the central premise upon which a text's central argument rests. A central premise writes (Sarup, 1989:40), "is any thought-system which depends on an unassailable foundation, a first principle or unimpeachable ground upon which a whole hierarchy of meanings may be constructed" This central premise is fundamental to Derrida's methodology, for it is here that the opposing terms are located, identifiable by what they include and exclude. Derrida argues that within this binary pair there is always a hierarchy. One of the two terms is understood as controlling the other, assumed to hold the superior position. It is understood to be more fully present, valuable and therefore more valued. The second term in the binarism is assumed to be dominated by the first, being defined as outside and less valuable than the first. Derrida writes,

> In a traditional philosophical opposition we have not a peaceful coexistence of acting terms but a violent hierarchy. One of the terms dominates the other (axiologically, logically, etc.) occupies the commanding position. To deconstruct the opposition is above all, at a particular moment, to reverse the hierarchy (Derrida, 1981:56,57).

For Derrida, the simple reversal of the hierarchical principles located in the text is insufficient to disrupt official sanctified knowledges. While the first move in deconstructing the metaphysical oppositions is to overthrow the hierarchy, there is a need to go beyond this reversal and into the strategy of displacement. Displacement for Derrida means continually erasing the superior term through endless and multiple interpretations of the text that deny the possibility of final meaning or knowledge (1993: 09). Derrida expresses this displacement strategy through the principle of *differance* constructed out of the French verbs 'to differ' and 'to defer' (1981:27).

Gestures of reversal and displacement allow meaning not only to be 'different' but to change since it is continually being displaced. "*Differance* then points to the absence of any primary site of meaning"(Murphy,1993:26). By continually reversing the hierarchies and shifting the stable meaning, the superior term loses its repressional advantage in the discourse. Derridean deconstructionist methodology insists on continually circumventing the value laden binary terms. The more often binary hierarchies are sought out, reversed and displaced within the discourse, the less often these types of value laden hierarchies will be available to shape the social construction of knowledge.

Foucault and Subjugated Knowledges

Like Derrida, Foucault is concerned about the relationship between language, truth and the authoritative subject, but his discursive methodology examines the nexus of power relations between individuals , institutions and the production of discourses. Foucault focuses on the production of text, because he views the text as part of a discursive network of power which obscures other forms of knowledge. In *The Orders of Discourse*, Foucault (1971:8) writes,

> In every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized and redistributed according to a certain number of procedures, whose role is to avert its powers and its dangers to cope with chance events, to evade its ponderous, awesome materiality .

To undermine and dismantle dominanting discourses, Foucault argues that it is necessary to seek out hidden, less valued knowledges. Rather than seeking to undermine the category of centrality in text altogether, Foucault proposes shifting the "grand" narratives out of their central position through the unveiling of alternative discourses. Foucault aims to make visible the subjugated knowledges which have been silenced and rendered invisible by the official discourses. The term "subjugated knowledges" refers to,

> ...a whole set of knowledges that have been disqualified as inadequate to their task or insufficiently elaborated: naive knowledges, located low down on the hierarchy, beneath the required level of cognition or scientificity...popular knowledge though it is far from being a general commonsense knowledge, but is on the contrary a particular, local, regional knowledge, a differential knowledge incapable of unanimity and which owes its force only to the harshness with which it is opposed by everything surrounding it -- through the reappearance of this knowledge... criticism performs its work (Foucault,1980:82).

In textual analysis, seeking out buried "counterpoint" lines of knowledge provides a method for unmasking the "truth", challenging what we know to be true through the presentation of alternative perspectives. It is a historical method that seeks to uncover knowledges that have been suppressed and in whose articulation Foucault sees the possibility for challenging the centrality of governing discourses. It is a technique that contests the authoritative "voice" and "position" of a controlling "line" in a discourse by seeking out and unveiling knowledges and voices that have been masked and unheard.

Regimes of Truth

While they differ in their approach to textual analysis, with Derrida taking us into the text to explore the endless variations of meanings available and Foucault focusing on how discourse is enmeshed with relations of power, both seek the dismantlement of modernist social approaches to knowledge that sanction and perpetuate oppressive academic discourses. It is in Foucault's conceptualization of "regimes of truth" that their insistence for the destabilization of the modernist terrain of knowledge production becomes clear.

Foucault argues that,

> Each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true (Foucault,1980:131).

Foucault insists on the necessity of analyzing critically how these regimes are created and sustained through the production and reproduction of power, knowledge and authority. Directing our focus towards the "regimes of truth" in which we work requires us to take responsibility for self-criticism and social critique without, "presuming a privileged path to knowledge or proposing an impossible escape from the social-historical sphere" (Thompson,1984:203).

These discursive methodological constructs set the stage for my journey into the heart of Native educational discourse. Taking up Gore's suggestion that as academics we need to assess critically our own role in the construction of knowledge, I have bound this study to Canadian Native educational academic discourse. I draw on Derrida's concept of deconstruction to move into the text to investigate the "central premise" on which the discourse is built. I use Foucault's claim that discourses operate as "regimes of truth" to unmask the relationship between knowledge, truth and authority in Native educational discourse. I do so by investigating the historical and social conditions which made this discourse possible in the first place and by uncovering some of the subjugated "lines" of knowledge that exist in this discourse.

Chapter Four

Cultural Determinism - Review of a Discourse

Princess Pocahontas,
Powhatan's daughter,
Stared at the white men
Come across the water.

She was like a wild deer
Or a bright, plumed bird,
Ready then to flash away
At one harsh word.

When the faces answered hers,
Paler yet, but smiling,
Pocahontas looked and looked,
Found them quite beguiling.

Liked the whites and trusted them,
Spite of kin and kith
Fed and protected
Captain John Smith.

Pocahontas was revered
By each and every one.
She married John Rolfe
She had a Rolfe son.

She crossed the sea to London
And must have found it queer,
To be Lady Rebecca
And the toast of the year.

"La Belle Sauvage!"
"La Belle Sauvage!"
Our non pareil is she!"
But Princess Pocahontas
Gazed sadly toward the sea.

They gave her silk and furbelows
She pined, as wild things do
And, when she died at Gravesend
She was only twenty two.

Poor wild bird ---
No one can be blamed.
But gentle Pocahontas
Was a wild thing tamed.

And everywhere the lesson runs,
All through the ages:
Wild things die
In the very finest cages.[1]

(Rosemary and Stephen Vincent Benet, 1936)

---

[1] I was helping one of my children's friends with his homework when I came across this poem. It was being used as an example of narrative poetry in a Grade Five classroom. His teacher told me it came from an exercise book that could be purchased at any teacher's store.

In this chapter I begin my investigation of the modernist "line" that serves to construct Native educational discourse. My analysis begins with the identification of two of the major "points" in Native educational discourse that serve to construct its modernist "line". The first of these theoretical "points" seeks explanation for the Native educational "situation" in macrosystemic analysis. First Nation(s) education is theorized, analyzed and explained by an examination which focuses on the broader societal aspects of the relationship between First Nation(s) peoples and Western education. The second theoretical "point" central to the construction of the Native educational modernist "line", is one that investigates the microsystemic relationship between the individual and formal schooling. Microsystemic analysis in Native educational discourse tends to be marked by its attention to the conflictual relationship between mainstream pedagogy, curriculum, and the cultural behaviours of First Nation(s) students in the classroom.

After outlining these two apparently divergent "points" of focus for theory and research in Native educational discourse, I will argue that both are driven by the same cultural concept and that in this central concept lies the *essence* of the modernist "line" found in Native educational discourse. As Thakur (1990:1) points out in his discussion of counterpoint, "it is necessary to begin with "the study of the essence of the line". The essence of the modernist Native educational "line" is a concept known as cultural determinism. It is a concept of culture embedded in an acculturation model put forth by the field of cultural anthropology over sixty years ago and one still employed extensively in Native educational discourse. I then discuss the peculiar problems associated with this concept of culture and its attendant acculturation model.

Macrosystemic Explanation - Group Dynamics

A large portion of the pre-dominant discourse that addresses Native education directs its attention to issues that pertain to the basic socio-cultural differences and inequities that exist between Euro-Canadian and First Nation(s) systems. It is an approach which explores educational issues in the broader context of institutional arrangements that historically have been established by the larger Canadian society. Analysis is directed towards the political, economic and legal status of First Nation(s) peoples and the relationship between this institutionalized position and Native education. The overarching theme in macrosystemic analysis is one which argues that economically, socially, politically and culturally, First Nation(s) as a group have been *effectively* curtailed and oppressed through systemic mechanisms. Prevalent in this theoretical approach to Native education is the view that educational policy and practice has been used as a powerful tool of Native social control and cultural destruction (Boldt 1985, King 1987, Long Boat 1987, Ryan 1989).

One of the more prominent macrosystemic frameworks used to investigate educational issues is the model of internal colonialism (Wall 1987, Makokis 1993, Perley 1993). The theory of internal colonialism is one which explores the means by which the colonizing group has subjugated the indigenous population within its national boundaries. Internal colonial theory takes the position that colonized peoples have been forced through various mechanisms of control to become economically, culturally, and politically inferior and dependent on the dominant group. It is a position that reads the relationship between the colonizing and indigenous peoples as one in which there has been total systemic domination by the colonizers.

In the theory of internal colonialism, the means by which this control is understood to be carried out is indicated by certain identifiable political and legal criteria. These criteria include, (a) the forced , involuntary entry of the colonized group into the dominant society, (b) the colonizing power adopting policies that suppress, transform, or destroy Native values, orientations and ways of life, (c) manipulation and management of the colonized by agents of the colonizing group, and (d) domination, exploitation and oppression justified by an ideology of racism which defines the colonized group as inferior (Perley,1993:19).

In the case of Canadian First Nation(s), the vested domination and control which characterizes internal colonialism takes the form of federal legislation known as the *Indian Act*. First passed in 1868 by the new Dominion of Canada, *The Indian Act* is the federal policy devised for the governance of "Indians". Included in this governance is specific policy directed towards the education of "Indians" (Perley,1993:122). Many articles have been written in Native educational discourse on the oppressive and destructive nature of the colonial educational policies state and church implemented and the schools where these policies were executed. Residential schools are perhaps the best example of the social control and cultural eradication promoted by the Indian Act. A number of authors (Cummins 1985, Miller 1987, Haig-Brown 1988, York 1989, Bull 1991) have recounted the abuse and resistance that occurred in these schools.[2] The basic educational argument put forth by internal colonial theorists is that in the broader social and political context, federal educational policy is not concerned with what the larger society generally understands as formal education but with education directed towards controlling and if at all possible, destroying the socio-cultural context that defines First Nation(s) peoples.

---

[2] Three arguments are generally made in support of residential schools. The first is that, residential schools produced the political leaders that eventually helped to ensure the demise of residential schools. "It was one of history's ironies that many of the post-war Indian leaders who were to argue the case for greater Indian control of Indian policy were the products of the residential schools...Many of these people had been deeply marked by their school experience, some traumaticallly. But they had also acquired sufficient skills to emerge as effective leaders of the organizations they fashioned, and from the later 1960's onward they made long strides in wresting control of Indian policy from the hands of bureaucrats and church people" (Miller,1987:10). This is an argument that tries to justify and rationalize the situation by suggesting that without the residential schools there would have been no First Nation(s) political leaders to help unbind the colonial state of affairs. In doing so, it makes it appear that there were no Native political leaders before or after the Euro-Canadian arrived and that really even though mistakes were made, residential schools gave a few of "them" the necessary tools to liberate their people. It is an argument

The current literature that focuses on macrosystemic issues in Native education often utilizes the internal colonial theory as a framework from which to investigate the current state of policy and administration in Native education, particularly the predominant issues of devolution and local control. Since the official devolution process began in the early 1970's, the effects of attempting to dismantle internal colonialist educational policies through transfer of control to bands has drawn the interest of a number of scholars in education (Elofson 1988, Hall 1992, Irwin 1992, Hollander 1993, DeWaal 1994). There is a general agreement in this literature that the process of political and legal devolution has been chaotic, confusing, too rapid and not particularly successful (Ward 1983, Young-Ing 1988, Makokis 1991, Goddard 1993). In his assessment of the devolution process, Denis Hall (1992:57) argues:

---

that suggests that there was no other way to produce sophisticated politically adept Native leaders.

The second argument often made is that residential schools were safe havens for some students whose parents and communites were falling apart under the ravages of disease, starvation and alcohol. This argument conveniently forgets to ask why this situation was occurring in the first place or looking at the role the colonial agenda played in creating the situation. Finally, there is the argument that not only First Nation(s) children but all immigrants were subjected to the same policies of cultural genocide - (I find the distinction between the English population and the rest of the immigrant population an interesting absence itself in this argument). However there is a significant distinction to be made between "immigrant" populations and First Nation(s) peoples. "Immigrants" came of their own accord and were never subjected to separate rules and regulations of goverance. First Nation(s) peoples were already here and came to be governed as a separate and distinct population.

> Over the past 20 years Indian bands across Canada have had various responsibilities associated with the operation of reserve schools transferred to them from the Canadian federal government. In most circumstances the transfer process, termed *devolution* by the federal government has been quick, poorly planned and ill conceived. Indian band councils, anxious to exert control over matters pertaining to their own destinies have virtually 'jumped from the frying pan into the fire'...Because of fiscal policy constraints, in most cases that are said to be band 'controlled' control is in fact retained by the federal government: band councils simply administer federal government policy, and band education committees only advise.

This consensus is based largely on the understanding that internal colonialism still remains firmly in place. Although band control over education has become the catch phrase of the day, it is viewed as more political talk than educational reality. Makokis (1993:3) writes that, "Devolution seems not to have addressed the political, legal, and economic relationships of the internal colonial model, but to have reinforced the dynamics of the asymmetrical relationship".

In one sense, macrosystemic approaches have been helpful in elucidating certain kinds of problems unique to Native education. They have captured some of the broader aspects of the unequal relationships prevalent between the larger Canadian society, indigenous populations and Native education. The general weakness of this approach taken in Native educational discourse, lies in its tendency to subjugate agency to system. As macrosystemic theories focus on social structure and system, they place society prior to individuals, portraying social actors as individuals who have no control over their lives,"...like puppets controlled by the strings of structure" (Bourdieu,1990:9).

The discourse that approaches Native education from a macrosystemic position, blankets the entire Native population under one roof. In other words, it is modernist discourse which objectifies and reduces all First Nation(s) peoples to one group and makes wide-sweeping generalizations about "their" educational situation. Hall, for instance (1992:57), cited in the passage above, argues that the whole process for *all* band-controlled schools has been poorly planned and poorly executed. He argues that the devolution process is seriously flawed and that educational programs delivered on reserves "are neither proactive nor sound, but rather comprise a doomed educational facade based on Indians' reaction and response to federal government proposals and policies developed for Indian education on reserves without any significant input from the Indians" (1992:60). His basic argument is one which concludes that because of the internal colonial structure, all First Nation(s) peoples who live on reserves have no agency, either in the control or administration of the schools. By extension, all band-operated schools are failures and all First Nation(s) individuals who go to these schools are doomed. It is a construction of First Nation(s) "others" which represents all First Nation(s) people as victims who can do no more than react to the colonial structure imposed upon them.

Microsystemic Analysis - First Nation(s) "Others" and Education

The second significant "point" used to construct the modernist line in Native educational discourse, concerns itself with the relationship between the individual and formal schooling. It is an approach which concentrates on cultural differences in world views, values, social organization, language and learning styles and how these effect the "other's" ability to learn in the classroom. There are any number of views taken on this issue of "cultural difference" but nearly all center their arguments within an "equality of opportunity/cultural discontinuity" framework.

The "equality of opportunity/cultural discontinuity" framework in Native educational discourse is itself based on two underlying assumptions. The first is that Native people are economically and socially disadvantaged because they haven't had a "proper" education (Cummins 1985, Lee 1986, McAlpine 1990, Charters-Voght 1991, Taylor, Crago & McAlpine 1993). Read (1983:526) for instance writes: "The poor economic status of the native population is often attributed in part at least to low levels of education. Efforts to improve the economic situation of Canada's native people have therefore included attempts to raise educational attainment".

The first part of this cause/effect argument takes its cues from functionalist theory. Functionalist theory is defined as those explanations which explain a social institution or practice in terms of its beneficial consequences for the social system as a whole or for some important subsystem.

> Social systems are seen as dynamic systems in which the parts play functional roles, and the goal of the functional analysis is to identify the role played by a particular institution or practice (Little,1991: 94).

It is a position that reads schools as beneficial institutions for social society because they produce productive, self-supporting individuals. This translates into the notion that one of the basic purposes of schools as institutions is the socialization of the young for the benefit of society as a whole. Located within this functionalist reading is the "equality of opportunity" ideology which sees the educational system as key in the distribution of societal meritocracy - contingent on the socialization of the young which the educational system claims is one of its functions.

Put another way, as a beneficial system, one of the roles of schooling is to provide "equality of opportunity" for those who pass through the system. However, in order for the educational system to perform its function, the individual must come already equipped with the social culture this same system claims it is responsible for imparting before "equality of opportunity" is possible. On one level, schools are understood to be responsible for socializing the young. At the everyday level, however, there is a peculiar reversal of responsibility. Rather than the school being held accountable for instilling the "right" social values and beliefs in the child, it is the child that must demonstrate these values and beliefs in order to access the educational opportunities the educational system offers. It is a contradictory argument since the educational system can only perform its function of transmitting social culture if the social culture is already held by the individual bearers. It is also the argument used quite extensively in Native educational discourse and is played out along the lines of cultural conflict theory.

Cultural Conflict

The second part of the cause/effect debate in the microsystemic strand of this discourse lies in its rationale for why the educational system has not been successful in performing its meritocratic function for First Nation(s) individuals. In microanalytical approaches to Native education the general argument is that the educational system cannot educate First Nation(s) "others" because the individuals coming into the system do not possess the appropriate cultural values and behaviours. Cultural conflict theory holds that First Nation(s) "others" have distinct systems of values and goals different from those embedded in the Euro-Canadian educational system and that these values and goals are not taken into account by the school. First Nation(s) "others" are seen as unsuccessful in claiming an education because of their cultural "differences". The argument is one that suggests that the schools cannot do their job because of the differences in the socio-cultural values of First Nation(s) peoples.

A much older discourse, cultural conflict works from the assumption that certain social characteristics identifiable by cultural "differences" are fundamental to deciphering the relationships between First Nation(s) "others, Euro-Canadian education and the "equality of opportunity" objective. Armstrong (1987:14) reflects the substance of this argument when she insists that: "the modern definition of education (the practice of schooling) stands in sharp contrast to the traditional indigenous view, which centres on education as a natural process occurring during everyday activities" (Fiordo 1988, Hollander 1993, Foreman 1993). Katz (1972: 407) provides an example of how this substantive "difference" is conceptualized in the literature. He writes that "the lack of success in schools of minority groups may be a reflection of the lack of relevance goals of the school to the competence goals towards which the child has been socialized by the transmitting agents of his own culture". In other words, the culture of First Nation(s) students and the culture of the school are in conflict with each other, placing First Nation(s) students at a disadvantage. It is these apparently irreconcilable discontinuities between specific First Nation(s) cultural characteristics and the culture of the school which provide the theoretical framework in microanalysis from which to explain the inability of the educational system to perform its function and from which to prescribe curricular and pedagogical modification and reform (Hawthorn 1967, Dumont 1972, Wyatt 1979, Philips 1983, Pepper & Henry 1991).

The concept of cultural conflict was supported in part by a theory particularly prevalent in the general educational literature before the 1970's. Known as cultural deprivation theory, it was a view that read educational failure as a direct result of the failure of the socialization process at home. "Some writers, particularly those who are psychoanalytically oriented, attribute the disadvantaged pupil's learning difficulties to a basic failure of the socialization process at home"(Katz,1972:15) In short, the student came from a background that was deficient. The "other" came from an impoverished situation because his/her culture was impoverished. Under the auspices of cultural deprivation, faulty early socialization, personality deficits, alienation, and broken homes were often cited as culturally induced and directly responsible for the incumbent social disadvantage suffered by the "other".

First Nation(s) children was seen as lacking in many of the necessary cultural configurations required for educational success. Their socio-cultural environment was a handicap to educational success. The general view held in the educational field was that these "deprived children should somehow have their lives 'enriched', that they should be exposed to and thereby internalize middle-class cultural values: such exposure would compensate for their cultural deprivation" (Katz,1972: 398). They needed to be socialized into Euro-Canadian culture before they could take advantage of the opportunities provided by the education system.

> For the Indian child, the school is an entirely new phenomenon with new cultural items and some of his previous patterns of learning are not of value in the school situation. The Indian child is face with the problems of overcoming disparate patterns of learning and of acquiring a new role in an unfamiliar setting (Hawthorn,1967:110).

With the change of socio-political climate in the 1960's and early 70's, the concept of cultural deprivation evolved into the idea of cultural disadvantage. This was the result of a backlash in the general educational arena against educational theory which advanced the idea that the only valid culture was Western culture. In Native educational discourse, this educational shift led to the argument that First Nation(s) children came from a culture which, while different from Euro-Canadian culture was none the less perfectly legitimate. However, since the "other's" culture was assumed to be based on different assumptions and processes from that on which Western middle-class educational principles were based, the students in question were placed at a disadvantage. It is an argument still used today in this discourse. Taylor, Crago and McAlpine (1993:178) demonstrate this line of reasoning when they write:

> Furthermore, white-middle class North American cultural patterns of guiding children's performance in preliteracy activities may not exist in Aboriginal homes, and consequently children may not be prepared to deal with the demands of schooling, although they are highly competent in meeting the demands placed on them by their homes and communities.

What is important to notice in these two passages is that while the educational objective in the literature has changed from cultural negation to cultural validation, the belief that it is cultural conflict which remains the central problem in achieving this educational goal remains the same.

Cultural Conflict and Education

In the microsystemic approach to Native education, this cultural conflict assumption undergirds the debates in Native educational discourse that revolve around how best to cross the cultural gap in schools, how to integrate First Nation(s)/Euro-Canadian education into the schools, and the educational quandaries related to doing so. Since the view in this discourse is one which accepts the overriding problem in the schools as one of cultural conflict, the next logical step is to look for ways to accommodate the conflict. The debate surrounding the First Nation(s) student and formal schooling, built as it were within this context of cultural conflict, takes three distinct positions on this curricular and pedagogical modification and reform.

The first position is one that seeks to develop educational theory and practice in order to improve the mainstream educational attainment of First Nation(s) children. The second is one which claims that since First Nation(s) children live "outside" of mainstream society, culturally appropriate education will provide the confidence and skills for Native students to function within their own societies. "A question that is frequently raised by educators in Aboriginal communities concerns the goals of schooling. The dilemma here is whether to educate children with a view to assimilating to mainstream culture or whether to concentrate education that prepares children for life in their home communities" (Taylor, Crago & McAlpine, 1993:176/177). In other words, based on the understanding that it is cultural conflict which creates the dissonance, the dilemma becomes whether the school's function should be to act as a socializing agent for Native culture or Euro-Canadian culture.

This reading of cultural conflict has produced a third position which argues that Native children should become bi-cultural. It is an argument that suggests the best way to approach the cultural mismatch is for Native children to become competent in both their own culture and Canadian culture. The federal policy document "Indian and Eskimo Affairs Program - Education" (1976: 4) asks, for instance, "How, then can native children grow in pride of self, in pride of race in this larger 'white' society? The report goes on to offer a biculturalist solution.

> For the native peoples, bi-culturalism is to be able to function in either of two cultures - the native community in which one is raised and the dominant society where one has chosen to become educated or to learn certain skills. This individual can choose to move from one culture to another as the occasion demands...As well as mastering two languages, the students gain an appreciation of their own cultural values and heritage, and an understanding of the ways and beliefs of the dominant society .

The school's function in the bicultural scenario is read as socializing the Native child not only into White culture but into Native culture as well. Those, like the federal government who advocate bicultural education, view it as a way to provide the long sought educational goal of "equality of opportunity" for Native children.

There are some interesting assumptions in this passage which tend to inform the microsystemic discourse as a whole. For this reason the above passage bears some attention. The first notable supposition is that First Nation(s) "others" are not familiar with the *ways and beliefs of the dominant society* and need to become so. It is an assumption that renders invisible the long relationship between Native peoples and Euro-Canadian society and writes Native and White as disconnected entities. The second assumption found in this bi-culturalist concept is that to become "educated" in the Western sense of the word is separate and distinct from being "educated" in the

Native sense of the word: "For the native peoples, bi-culturalism is to be able to function in either of two cultures - the native community in which one is raised and the dominant society where one has chosen to *become educated or to learn certain skills*"(1976:5). The suggestion is that Native children need to be taught about their "culture" (a thing) - a subtext which reads culture as a subject area to be studied rather like art or music appreciation classes and one that is viewed as separate and distinct from being "educated" or learning certain skills in the Euro-Canadian sense.

In the microsystemic approach, this particular understanding of "culture" as something to be studied is found in the debates on how to integrate First Nation(s) "cultures" into the school. (Richardson, 1986, McCaskill 1987, Oakes 1988, Koen 1989) are but a few of those who have tackled this question. Generally, because "culture" is objectified as a "thing" to be taught, it is provided through add-on classes such as beading and tanning. Viewed this way, culture is seen as symbolic - a collection of material things or activities disconnected from their real meaning or context. Koens (1989:40) notes that this type of cultural understanding in the classroom "typically, results in a proliferation of school activities which develop expertise in such exotic minutiae as beadwork, carving and Indian dancing".

Pedagogically, cultural conflict theory in Native educational discourse relies heavily on the belief that First Nations students have distinct learning styles and behaviours which inhibit their learning. Some of the more familiar of these distinctions are: 1) "Native children may become easily embarrassed and apologetic if it is pointed out to them that they are doing or saying something that is different (Pepper & Henry,1991:147), 2) "One might safely hypothesize that verbal skills are not as highly valued due to the style of interaction between Native parents and children[3] (Common and Frost,1988:27), 3) "Teachers need to emphasize being rather than doing, past and present rather than future, and harmony with nature rather than subjugation of nature (Clifton,1988:341), 4) "At the age of mobility, the child is considered a person and left relatively free to create and explore his own environment" (Hawthorn 1967:112). A great deal of the Native educational discourse that utilizes a microsystemic approach embraces these core cultural markers to explain the educational difficulties *all* Native students experience in schools.

---

[3] One has to wonder how the deemphasis on verbal skills and the emphasis on oral

> It will be shown that even under optimum conditions, i.e., a high level of native involvement there are still obstacles to creating a curriculum expressive of native culture. In particular there are aspects of Native culture which are not compatible with the culture of the schools; specifically, two learning styles - that of the school and that of the native community... My observations, reinforced by commentary of native people involved in the program indicate that there is a community learning style and a school learning style. In the community the usual way for a child to learn a skill from an adult is to observe carefully over long periods of time and then to begin taking part in the activity (Wyatt,1979:17,23).

The general recommendation made in the predominant Native educational discourse is to adjust pedagogy to reflect First Nation(s) learning styles. This includes allowing student-directed small group learning, de-emphasizing competition in favor of cooperation, using holistic learning approaches and allowing students to watch before asking them to do the task. It is an argument that suggests that the educational "problems" in the classroom can be "fixed" by incorporating Native "culture" into both pedagogy and curriculum. In other words it is the irrelevant material and the inability of the students and teacher to communicate that is seen to form the nexus of Native peoples educational difficulties (Clifton 1988, Stairs 1991, Foreman 1992).

---

tradition, two central cultural markers in this discourse, can be logically reconciled.

If the weakness of macrosystemic theories in Native education lie in their neglect of the individual, educational theories which focus on individuals and mark them through specific group characteristics and behaviours do just the reverse. Theories that focus on the individual "other" in relation to formal schooling can be critiqued on the grounds that they fail to acknowledge the relationship between First Nation(s) peoples and the wider context of systemic imposition. This microsystemic approach disconnects First Nation(s) individuals from the socio-political and historical conditions that have shaped their lives, and writes "culture" as if it occurred in a void. More importantly it is a representation which argues that the "cultural" differences of this group are the same for all individuals placed under the First Nation(s) label. Furthermore, these "differences" remain exactly the same as they were four hundred years ago- uncorrupted and unchanged by virtues of the group's homogeneous and insular immutability. In short, it depoliticizes its analysis of Native education, constructing the "object" of its study in general and universal terms to do so.

The Construction of Culture in Native Educational Discourse

As analytical approaches to Native educational discourse, macro and micro analysis appear to take up dissimiliar approaches in the search for "explanation" in Native education. Indeed, it if hard to imagine how these two "points" of theoretical reference could be any more divergent in their reading of the "problem". As "different" as these two approaches seem, it is from the same concept of culture that both take their cues. As I argued in Chapter Three, a general overview of this discourse does not point to one person or a select group of persons whose authority controls the field. Instead, the reverse is true; there is a *particular cultural text* which controls the prevalent discourse, authorizing the majority of those who work in this field.

This conceptualization of "culture", which has bound itself so tightly to discussions of education, has become one of the unquestioned, unproblematized "truths" of this discourse. Moreover, it is a conceptualization that serves to reify the relations of culture and education and acts as the central binding and boundary condition for criticism and reform. The difficulties in education are explained and reduced to long term conflict which in turn is explained (away) as the result of the raw fact of cultural "differences". Put another way, culture is perceived to be the cause of the palpable tension and difficulties in attempts to provide, change or improve education for First Nation(s) peoples. Both macro and micro approaches in the controlling Native educational discourse, take as given the possibility of detailing and therefore reducing to certain specifics, the very essence of what it means to be Native. It is what is known in sociology as an essentialist theoretical position, for it "supports the position that it is possible to attain absolute, incorrigible knowledge of the essence of an object" (Sayer,1992:163).

Consider for instance, the literature that tackles Native education from the perspective of systemic domination. Internal colonial theory understands internal colonialism as a system which developed in part from the understanding that aboriginal cultures were all the same and uniformly alien, coupled with the unwavering belief that First Nation(s) peoples needed to be assimilated into the more "advanced" European culture. While macrosystemic analysis might ignore the individual in relation to the wider sphere, it nevertheless takes up unquestioned notions of group identity. There is a peculiar tendency in macrosystemic theory that addresses Native educational issues to "give" First Nation(s) societies a specific homogeneous "group" status - one where all individuals are represented by their similar powerlessness to do anything but react to the circumstances of their subjugation. However, as Van den Berghe(1981:182) stresses, one of the identifiable characteristics of internal colonialism "...is a legal status ascribed to subordinate groups who have a corporate, group status that *takes precedence over their individual status*"(emphasis added). Ironically, those who approach Native educational literature from this perspective end up supporting the very internal colonialism they are attempting to undermine. They do so because they apply a certain cultural script to a whole population regardless of gender, age, geographic location, or affiliation.

Microanalysis which focuses on pedagogy and curriculum relies on exactly the same essentialist assumptions. This type of analysis also takes as social "fact" that essential "cultural" differences are responsible for the widely documented educational malaise. Indeed, the driving force in this micro approach to Native educational discourse centres around the negative effects this "difference" has had for all Native people in relation to Euro-Canadian education. In seeking the answers to the Native educational situation, microanalysis separates First Nation(s) individuals from their relationship with the mainstream world, arguing that it is the "different" cultural beliefs and behaviours of the "others" that creates the dissonance in the classroom.

In Chapter Three, I discussed some of the research being done in the early 1970's that I considered far more pertinent to Native educational issues than much of the work currently being produced. Among this research were some very interesting pedagogical studies done by Judith Kleinfeld. I think these studies bear mentioning in order to demonstrate the dangers of following the prevalent line of reasoning in the discourse. Studying the pedagogical approaches of teachers in Native classrooms, Kleinfeld identified an number of pedagogical approaches, two which I will briefly outline.

One of the more prominent pedagogical approaches Kleinfeld identified was the "traditionalist" approach. Traditionalist pedagogues reflect the "cultural deprivation" position found in the broader educational theory. These teachers believe that if Native people would just accept and adopt white values and economic strategies their incumbent difficulties would magically vanish. Traditionalist educators often perceive that a major part of their job is not teaching the curriculum, but changing the beliefs, attitudes and values, the very identity of Native students.

> The fact that Indian life is so alien to Anglo teachers intensifies their efforts to remodel children. They attempt to shape children's attitudes, skills and classroom behaviours into familiar patterns. These efforts whether carried out by gentle, coaxing, programmed reinforcement or harsh and punitive methods result in a lack of participation on the part of Indian children in their own education and a high drop-out rate (John,1976:331).

Another pedagogical approach Kleinfeld identified was that of the "Professional Distance-Passive Understanding-Sophisticates". This pedagogical approach correlates to "cultural disadvantage" educational theory . Trying to incorporate cultural understanding and relevance, it is a pedagogical approach that continually focuses on the cultural differences found between the community and the Western classroom. These teachers tend to be highly educated and have strong backgrounds in anthropology. Kleinfeld (1975:32) argues that the educational results of this type of pedagogical approach are as harmful as those of the "Traditionalists".

> While sophisticated teachers in integrated classroom did little damage beyond making village students feel uncomfortable and teaching them little, the sophisticate in an all-Native classroom could do serious harm. Interested in the psychology of Native-white differences, they reinforced the students' sense of being different. They might socialize village students into the stereotyped role behaviour that their anthropological studies had led them to expect.

Typecasting all Native children in certain ways, be these negative or positive, allows no room for individuality, growth or change. Instead, Native students become encumbered by a representation that predetermines who they are and the limits of their possibilities.

Acculturation Theory

Of those who direct their attention to critical analysis of this underlying cultural concept, Carl Urion has been the most constant. Spanning a time period of twenty years, his voice speaks the loudest in its insistence towards reflection and critical analysis of Native educational discourse. It is worth quoting him at length as what he writes in his latest contribution, *First Nations Postsecondary Education: A Review* (1995) reflects the basic argument he has been making for the last two decades. Identifying quite clearly the two prominent positions taken in Native educational discourse he writes,

> ...despite the volume of it, the literature is neither well developed nor cumulative. It is on the one hand particularistic, with a wealth of local description interpreted in the light of competing low-level theories (e.g. low achievement related to self-concept), on the other hand, it is typified by sweeping and global argument (e.g., low achievement a symptom of a larger malaise that will be remedied by various interventions to bring about "empowerment"). It does not seem to constitute an academic tradition (Urion, 1991:168).

For Urion, the fundamental problem with Native educational discourse is located in its consistent use of a specific type of acculturation theory. Urion views this acculturation theory as the background in Native educational discourse against which everything else is mapped. He notes: "Almost 20 years ago, Hedley examined our major literatures and theoretical discourses in Native education and said that that [acculturation] model typified virtually all our academic literature...It is still fundamental to a great deal of academic discourse and practice" (Urion,1991:4). It is this acculturation model of culture that provides the governing Native educational discourse with its particular concept of culture. It is a concept of culture that establishes two "truths": the homogeneity of Native group/individual cultural characteristics underwritten by the group's enduring values and beliefs and the representation of Native peoples as one group that is both stable and autonomous.

This acculturation framework, which serves as the foundation for Native educational discourse, can be defined as follows: "a *change in culture induced by contact with another culture and followed by a change in patterned ways of acting"* (Assheton-Smith,1977:5, emphasis added). Originating in the area of cultural anthropology in the1930's and 40's, it is a model based on cultural theory which interprets "culture" as "something" that gives society its form, particularly the values held by members of a society . The concept of culture in this acculturation model is one that understands culture as a "set of idealized beliefs, or values, upon which social relations (or social structure) are based. Since culture is understood to be based first and foremost on a set of generalized beliefs, it is perceived to shape both individual personality and determine the pattern of social relationships which exist in a society" (Assheton-Smith,1977:5).

Both macro and micro systemic approaches to Native education, take as given the deep-ingrained mainstream belief that as a group First Nation(s) peoples can be excluded from the rest of Canadian society by certain identifiable boundaries. These boundaries are constructed in the acculturation model through a representation of all First Nation(s) peoples as a singular group marked by universal cultural categories. The acculturation model not only establishes the structure of the group in terms of cultural characteristics and organization but also its ability to function based on these universal configurations. In its construction of culture, the acculturation model objectifies Native culture as an integrated and harmonious monolithic entity united by certain immutable values which in turn determine individual/group behaviour. Put another way, culture is objectified by a conceptualization which understands the cultural values and beliefs of the group as stable and uniform at an individual level; that is, all First Nation(s) peoples hold certain values and beliefs. In turn, these values and beliefs are understood as determining the behaviour of the group and the possibilities of the group as a whole. Culture determines behaviour. As Carl Urion (1991:3) notes, acculturation is, "defined as a cultural determinist model for it assumes that we can describe cultural configurations, values, and rules and then predict individual or modal behaviour". As an aside to this framework he writes,

> The framework accomplishes this conceptual magic not by looking at anything "Native" at all, surely not by looking at "Native" values on their own terms, but rather by beginning with the assumption that this social dynamic is objectively and empirically describable (Urion,1991:4).

Cultural Determinism: The Essence of the Modernist "Line"

The educational discourse that concerns itself with First Nation(s) peoples and schooling abounds with infinite examples of cultural determinist theory. Explanations dressed within this narrowly bound conceptualization of culture and tied to educational incongruity, mismatch, clash, conflict are so pervasive that except for a few noteworthy exceptions, nearly all the Native educational literature that has been reviewed is firmly grounded in this practice. As Haig- Brown (1995:238) argues, "There is a large body of literature on First Nation's education that would identify 'the problem' in terms of cultural conflict. This is dangerous in that is assumes cultural determinism, but it is precisely where one looks to define the problem of oppression".

The concept of cultural determinism which has gained such notoriety within the field of Native education is social theory filtered through a detailed description of the "culture" being addressed. The concept of cultural determinism, writes Burtonwood (1986:65), is grounded on the following premises;

> Different cultures have distinct ways of managing human relationships, acquiring beliefs about the world and evaluating human action and there is no transcultural standard in terms of which to describe and evaluate these different frameworks. This

> perspective is particularly welcome to interpretive social scientists, for it validates their vow that each culture is a unique particular and that social inquiry must begin with the meaningful definitions of the culture under study.

Cultural determinism is a theoretical construct that utilizes a *seemingly* neutral construction of culture as an explanatory category. In this sense, the notion of culture closely resembles Thompson's neutral conceptualization of ideology; it is a conceptual tool that does nothing more than offer the impartial description of differentiated human collectives. The "other" [First Nation(s) peoples] are lumped together under one blanket and their "cultures" are objectified as no more than certain artifacts, dress, dance, language, world view, values and beliefs.

However as Urion (1995:184) points out, "the conceptual problem with the idea is not just that the premise of determinism has never been demonstrable but that the construct adds no explanatory power to a description of a situation". As a theoretical concept, cultural determinism is predisposed to reify culture as a singular object - an entity unto itself. Cultural determinism separates "culture" from both its bearers and from the rest of the society with which it interacts.

In Native educational discourse, the concept of cultural determinism leads to the conclusion the First Nation(s) peoples are unable to transcend "cultural" boundaries on their own. Explanation for the educational discord is generally laid at the cultural feet of First Nation(s) peoples; either their inability to adopt Euro-Canadian culture and/or the persistence of First Nation(s) peoples to adhere to traditional Indian culture (Assheton-Smith,1977). In separating out Native culture and the outside world, it is the culture of the "others" that lies at fault for the classroom dissonance.

What makes this cultural determinist concept particularly damaging for Native peoples in terms of education, is that it presents a reified account of culture which is then employed as the principal explanation for the failure of the education system to meet its functional mandate for this group. Reflecting what I suggest is the overriding focus in Native educational discourse, Barnett and Dyer in their review of the graduate research directed towards Native People in Saskatchewan, noted that the category "School and Teaching Processes" dominated the research. In a final assessment of the research being produced. the authors write: "A critical assessment indicates that there appears to be an excessive preoccupation with describing and evaluating the development of programs or people" (1983:18).

The central difficulty with this type of theoretical approach is that it leads to monocausal explanations which often "position causation without consideration of the context in which these factors operate" (Cortes, 1986:16). Indeed, while it is one thing to link culture and education, it is quite another to make a causal connection between the two, let alone identify the processes and pathways involved in the construction of the two markers. The cultural determinist approach in Native educational discourse does not in any concrete manner demonstrate that the identified general connections between education and culture do in fact exist, except through the particular idea of what ought to be, based on what is understood to be the permanent unchanging values of a singular First Nation(s) culture. There is simply an assumed cause/effect relation which holds that culture is the cause of the so often documented perception of Native educational debility.

Moreover, Native educational discourse that uses the concept of cultural determinism as its guiding framework, results in education for First Nation(s) peoples being associated with simplistic and often ethnocentric stereotypes of "other cultures" and represents a way of perpetrating the notion of a "great divide" between "modern" and "traditional" societies. It does so because the concept of cultural determinism objectifies "culture" as a thing reducible to general essential laws which are then used to construct First Nation(s) individuals as the "other"/ object . It is a representation that not only victimizes and delegitimizes First Nation(s) peoples, but rationalizes the terms of the educational relationship between First Nation(s) societies and Euro-

Canadian society. As the *essence of the modernist line* in Native educational discourse, cultural determinism frames the educational debate in ways that continually engender societal exclusion. Justified in multiple ways through a construction of the First Nation(s) "others" as deficient, unable to change and without power, Native educational discourse which builds its arguments on the cultural determinist premise is a discourse that silences, masks, negates and excludes.

In this chapter I discussed the two major focal "points" for the theory and research that make up the bulk of the modernist discourse in Native education. The first position I identified was macrosystemic theory and research, an approach that focuses on the contextually broader issues that impact on First Nation(s) education. The second common approach I identified in Native educational discourse was microsystemic analysis. It is an approach that focuses on the relationship between the Native "others", cultural "differences" and the impact these "differences" have on schooling experiences. My purpose in doing so was three fold. First, I wanted to illustrate how the cultural conflict is coupled with functionalist educational theory in a way that produces a circular cause/effect argument. Second, I wanted to demonstrate how two common, but apparently divergent theoretical approaches to Native education are based on the same cultural determinist concept, embedded in the "master" narrative of acculturation theory in the discourse. Finally, I wanted to convey some of the problems inherent with this modernist approach to the production of knowledge in Native educational discourse.

Chapter Five

Never Confuse Motion With Progress

> **Stories are formed. The formation of the story is particular and perceptible. The storyteller proceeds according to a plan, a design, a sense of proportion and order. Stories are begun, they proceed and they come to an end. Stories are predicated upon belief. Belief is more essential to the story than is understanding.**
>
> (N.Scott Momaday, 1991: vii)

In the last chapter, I reviewed the prominent Native educational discourse and argued that the essence of the modernist "line" underlying the education/culture debate was found in a concept of "cultural determinism" embedded in an exceedingly outdated acculturation model. I made the claim that so deeply embedded is this modernist concept, one which assumes that it is possible to describe certain Native cultural configurations and from these, predict individual/group behaviour, that it is very rarely considered problematic or challenged in Native education. Instead cultural "difference" as defined by the governing discourse is held to be the cause of the incompatibility between school and Native students. It is a central part of the grand narrative which holds Native educational together - the "regime of truth" in which the debate circulates regardless of the position taken.

Postmodern Theory and Native Education

In this chapter, I investigate how postmodern theory is being used to address the issues of education and culture in the Native educational discourse. To do so, I have chosen to deconstruct, in Derridean terms, two current articles in this discourse that claim a postmodern perspective. The first article, written by Jane Foreman in 1993, is titled, "Questioning Power Structures and Competitiveness in Pedagogy - Insights from North American Indian and Philippine Pedagogies". The second is the article, "Disciplining the Innut: Normalization, Characterization, and Schooling" written by James Ryan in 1989.

I have chosen these two articles for three reasons. The first is that postmodern theory claims to challenge the modernist "line" of social knowledge construction. The veracity of this claim needed to be tested and so I chose two case studies that used postmodern theory to ground their research . Second, these two articles appear to stand in direct opposition to each other, both in their focus of analysis and in the conclusions they reach concerning the dilemmas surrounding Native education and the possible solutions envisioned. Finally, these articles illustrate quite nicely Foucault's (1978:100-102) insistence that as "regimes of truth",

> Discourses are tactical elements or blocks operating in the field of force relations; there can exist different, and even contradictory discourses within the same strategy; *they can, on the contrary, circulate without changing their form from one strategy to another, opposing strategy* (emphasis added).

Put another way, even though these two articles claim a postmodernist reading of the situation, their analysis of Native education lies on the modernist "line" of acculturation theory and cultural determinism. Beginning with Jane Foreman's discussion of participative pedagogy, I propose to deconstruct the respective differential positions and arguments of these two articles. It is a deconstruction that aims to challenge the privileged and reductionist standpoints authorized by objectified accounts of First Nation(s) culture and to detail the "regime of truth" in which Native educational discourse circulates. I will argue that this "regime of truth" is driven by ideological strategies inherent to both educational "equality of opportunity" doctrine and the concept of cultural determinism.

Foreman's article centres around a discussion on the pedagogical philosophy and methods of "popular theatre". Her pedagogical intent "is to demonstrate how popular theatre can play a major role in democratizing the provision of education and in encouraging *educational development in circumstances where other approaches have been ineffectual*" (1993:561,emphasis added). To this end, Foreman argues on behalf of what she describes as "participative approaches to pedagogy which appear to have been successful in opening up possibilities for the educational development of aboriginal groups" (1993:561). In conjunction with this practical approach to pedagogy, Foreman provides an account of "ethical democracy" theory which she uses as the basis for this pedagogical and curricular alternative.

To support her position that participative pedagogies are a solution to Native educational problems, Foreman (1993:562), begins by legitimating her "voice" of expertise through her "experience which came from a six-year period in the role of non-native facilitator in *isolated* native communities in western and northern Canada, leading to *some* understanding of Native approaches to teaching and learning". Having established her authority to speak (her experience) and her basic premise (that other approaches to Native educational development have been ineffectual), Foreman then delineates the historical parameters from which she and the readers will take their cues. Evoking the long established story of the history of Native education in Canada she outlines the colonial history of First Nation(s) peoples as one of passive degeneration occasioned in part by Euro-centric educational practices. Almost as if First Nation(s) individuals were ghosts arising from the dead, Foreman outlines what she considers to be the recent struggle of First Nation(s) peoples against Euro-Canadian domination, marking the early 1970's as the beginning of the their collective resurrection (1993).

Having constructed the sociohistorical parameters, Foreman goes on to offer a description of the ways in which "Native education" differs from that of "Euro-

Canadian education". True to modernist constructions of "culture" (Chapter Four) she isolates First Nation(s) as a singular group marked by specific cultural behaviours. The following is a list of those cultural characteristics Foreman (1993) considers relevant to her understanding of Native culture. Foreman marks First Nation(s) cultural "difference" as: communication that avoids direct questioning (564), response times that are reflective and uninterrupted (566), and a learning style that is self-evaluating and autonomous (568). Foreman presents the reader with a familiar representation of Native culture and people which includes specific identifiable cultural characteristics universal for *all* First Nation(s) individuals[1]. Having identified these well known differences in First Nation(s) learning, Foreman proposes what she considers a more culturally compatible educational model, that of popular theatre. Foreman argues that like Native pedagogy, in popular theatre, "content and activities are not imposed but elicited/offered and guided. Questions have no right/wrong answers but anticipate many possible solutions. Leadership is shared and problem-solving is the joint responsibility of all group members" (564).

To support her position that popular theatre pedagogy could be used to cross the cultural void, Foreman takes up "ethical" democracy theory. She defines democracy as a living struggle, and democracy in education as the struggle to include all that is person-expanding, enlightening, liberating and empowering. Foreman understands democracy as "a daily struggle to honour and value the human possibilities in each and every person" (1993:569). Foreman places this theoretical notion of ethical democracy in the centre of a multicultural educational approach which is to be informed by the *postmodern* understanding that all knowledge is partial and that no knowledge can make a monolithic claim to absolute truth. Put another way, she makes the claim that since all knowledge is equally valid, so all people have a contribution to make to global knowledge. Foreman asserts that "different ways of knowing" should be embraced and celebrated by all cultures both inside and outside the classroom.

---

[1] That popular theatre pedagogical strategies resemble progressive educational pedagogy or the fact that progressive educational pedagogies have been a part of Western educational practices for a number of years appears to be lost on Foreman.

Under the rubric of a multicultural curriculum, she argues is that it is necessary to teach children about their own culture and help them understand how their culture teaches its knowledge through provision of curriculum that includes a celebration and reinforcement of the student's cultural and personal knowledge. She maintains that the implementation of this curriculum is contingent on teachers becoming aware of their own cultures as well as "other" cultures. In turn, teachers are to facilitate the "other's" awareness of their own valuable ways of knowing. Evoking Giroux, she asserts that "the basis of the alternative pedagogy advocated, is that all learners become conscious of how much they and their cultures know and how much can be learned from other persons and cultures" (1993:572). This celebration of knowledge is to be realized through the empowerment of individuals through pedagogy more closely matched to their own group "style" of learning, in this case, popular theatre. Foreman's position is one that articulates a vision for the enhanced educational development of First Nation(s) people through "new and improved" alternative curriculum and pedagogical strategies inscribed upon notions of democracy.

Keeping in mind both Foreman's argument that pedagogy has to be adjusted to the different learning styles of First Nation(s) students and democratically constructed within a multicultural curriculum that acknowledges the relativism of knowing and celebration of cultural difference, I would like to now consider James Ryan's (1989) polemical reading and analysis of First Nation(s) education. Rather than approaching Native education from a microanalytical position (Foreman's pedagogical and curriculum perspective), Ryan's article, "Disciplining the Innut: Normalization, Characterization, and Schooling" takes a macrosystemic approach, examining systemic organizational constraints that effect the education of the Innut. He is particularly interested in the impact of these constraints on what he identifies as the "phenomenon of Native school dropouts in an Innu community" (1989:379). Ryan's central argument is premised on the basis that it is Western organizational devices which ultimately constrain and inhibit the educational development of Innut students. His analysis as such, revolves around an investigation of the educational and community organizational spheres of Labrador Innut.

Contrary to Foreman's pedagogical approach to Native education, Ryan attempts to build his line of argument along structural lines, informed by Foucault's notion of "discipline". Ryan's rationale for employing Foucauldian analysis is his belief that research which focuses on the inappropriateness of imposed outside [Euro-Canadian] culture within Native classrooms will do little to alleviate the current educational malaise. He writes,

> Researchers using the 'concept of cultural differences' believe that Native students who enter schools carry with them cultural baggage that not only differs from, but conflicts with that which is embedded in school practices and it is this incongruity that inhibits these students from succeeding within this context (1989:380).

Unlike Foreman, he maintains that trying to adjust curriculum and pedagogy to cultural differences will not solve the problem of the high drop out rate for First Nation(s) students. Ryan (1989:382) argues: "as such, adjusting classroom practices to overcome cultural incongruities will do little to alleviate the difficulties associated with native education, since at least part of the problem takes root beyond the school and local community".

The problem he claims, is not one of a mismatch between classroom and culture, but one of a mismatch between Innu macro-organizational techniques and those created and deployed by the larger Euro-Canadian society. For Ryan, it is the manner in which Euro-Canadian society organizes its time and space in order to control and discipline its members (including the Innut) that is a major cause of Innu educational underdevelopment. His position thus becomes one which supports the previously identified theoretical strand of macrosystemic analysis. In this, Ryan echoing such authors as Ingram (1983), Boldt (1985), and Longboat (1987) produces a theory of Innut social/cultural formation which advocates individual/group passivity - as a group the only possibility open to them is to endure the system imposed upon them from the outside.

> Utilizing a global approach...I will focus on the stratifying qualities associated with the pervasive administration practices of Euro-Canadian society, a system of social organization that Foucault refers to as discipline. Techniques associated with "discipline" that facilitate the organization of men and women through such practices as the division of space and time, the employment of observation individualizing, and evaluation methods are adopted in one form or another by most institutions in the Western world (1989:382).

Ryan also offers a brief historical outline and a description of Native cultural characteristics. Diverging from Foreman, whose central discursive sociohistorical tenet is recent cultural re-birth, Ryan marks the sociohistorical boundaries of this Innu community firmly within cultural conflict rhetoric of decay and despair. For instance he writes:" ...the Innut are rapidly losing that foundation that had previously given their lives meaning and value" (1989:390). Ryan as did Foreman then provides the reader with a catalogue of Innut cultural characteristics; categorized this time not under pedagogical styles but under organizational devices. It is in these cultural organizational differences between Euro-Canadian and Innu that he sees an inevitable and irreconcilable clash.

> Discipline as described by Foucault was virtually absent from traditional Innu life. This particular life-style was characterized by an absence of institutional hierarchy, surveillance, rigid parameters on space and time, material enclosures, the interference in others'

> lives, and individualization. Furthermore, Innut organized their lives not around institutions bent on attaining maximum productivity, but on subsistent hunting patterns (sic).[2] In fact, powerful controls (much different than the modern forms of organization) dictated Innu life ways (Ryan 1989:400).

Having established his cultural scaffolding, Ryan draws out for examination the Euro-centric "disciplinary" mechanisms he claims have rendered the Innu highly visible as a group, mechanisms established specifically to discipline, control and regulate individual behavior and conduct.[3]

> Non-Innu employers such as the school, Social Services, the clinic, the drug rehabilitation center, and Wild life and Transport Canada, among others, look to further their (non-Innu) interests by regulating the behavior of those Innut whom they employ. These agencies subject employees to temporal and spatial demands, meticulously prescribe desired behavior, and enforce such standards through constant observation and application of rewards and punishments (Ryan,1989:389).

Following this line of reasoning, Ryan draws the conclusion that Innu and Euro-Canadian organizational apparatuses are so "culturally" different in terms of space, time and structure that there is very little hope of mediating the two; the Innut are doomed to a position of marginality. His conclusion is one of abject pessimism. He writes, "By creating, defining and sanctioning normative standards that may be very different from those that minority groups uphold, Euro-Canadian society ensures these groups are relegated to their subservient positions in the dominant society" (1989:389).

---

[2] In Ryan's "assumption" that the Innut based their lives on subsistent hunting patterns, a difference which he fails to prove, there is a value judgement built into the very notion of the word subsistence - subsistence suggests the inability to do anymore than eek out a living in order to survive.

[3] Ryan bases the analysis in his paper on Foucault's geneology of power which is a form of inquiry that knowledge itself is rooted in power relations. The task of the geneology of knowledge thus becomes that of "analyzing these power/knowledge relations in the context of the 'disciplinary regimes' that use expertise to construct social order. From this perspective, power is not just something located in centers controlled by identifiable agents but is diffused through society and inscribed in the very bodies of the dominated" (Morrow,1994:108).

Deconstructing Foreman and Ryan

Having drawn a rough outline of the polemic theoretical and educational positions presented by Foreman and Ryan, I now turn to an investigation of the central theoretical principles that inform the discursive construction of these two texts.

> By exposing within metanarrative claims to autonomy a contradictory reliance upon precisely those 'false' epistemological elements which it understands itself to eschew, the deconstructive gesture unravels the notion of 'centrality' designating it ultimately as 'undecidable' (Murphy,1993:84).

What marks both articles is analysis woven out of the same modernist cloth. Both authors, despite their claims to postmodernity, fall back onto modernist terrain. They do so through a transcription of the "other" that leans heavily on a modernist conceptualization of Native culture. Both authors effectively isolate First Nation(s) as a collective, marking, classifying and excluding them on the grounds of identifiable pedagogical or organizational characteristics. As Murphy points out,

> Under Enlightenment conceptions, subjectivity has been postulated in terms of sameness('identity') and coherence or wholeness ('individuality'). Postmodern and poststructuralist theories suggest that this description of subjectivity is an ideological tool which masks the actually fragmented character of the self. In this sense, the claim that subjectivity is discursively constructed challenges the injunction within dominant Western discourse to view human beings as unified, rational and fully conscious social actors (1993:43).

Essentially, Ryan and Foreman simply paint postmodern theoretical notions of curriculum, pedagogy and discipline over the same pre-established modernist constructions of culture found in the majority of modernist Native educational discourse.

> Students are also assessed on a whole range of personal characteristics, including those associated with a way of life[traditional] that in many respects is still very different from the dominant society (Ryan,1989:396).

> Different cultures, by definition, differ in the way they are affected by their world and by the ways in which they affect it...They come to know their world both affectively and cognitively and by their selection for attention and by the values they exert through the meanings they elicit (Foreman,1993:571).

In sliding back on to the modernist terrain, both authors disregard the postmodern perspective they claim to represent. They construct the "other" in ways that present an objectified account of a group of people with certain universal cultural values and behaviours. Postmodern discourses however, are supposed to seriously question ideas, concepts and methodologies which make fundamental claims to universal knowledge and that write subjects as objects of history.

> The postmodern critique of totality also represents a rejection of foundational claims...*Validity claims that rest on essentializing and transcendent metadiscourses are viewed with suspicion and skepticism, and are regarded as ideological expressions of particular discourses embodying normative interest and legitimating historically specific relations of power* (Giroux, 1991:68, emphasis added).

Cultural Determinism, Education and Liberal Ideology

Having identified the basic cultural premises that contextualize both articles - a modernist construction of Native culture, I propose to begin further unravelling the cultural premises upon which these stories of cultural incongruity have been mapped through an investigation into the ideological undercurrents which run through much of Native educational discourse Identifying the ideological terrain underlying this discourse will help to expose the "regime of truth" in which Native educational discourse operates. This "regime of truth" once unveiled, will enable the deconstruction of the text in ways that unmask how certain buried meanings and interpretations intersect with power and authority in the social construction of the "other".

Liberal Ideology

The "regime of truth" that Foreman and Ryan's apparently polemic positions circulate in I suggest is strongly encoded in Western liberal ideology. Western liberalism, as Theo Goldberg explains is based on a core set of basic beliefs and ideas. These include the application of certain universal principles to all human beings. "These principles are based on a belief that persons can be united on moral grounds, eliminating divisions which may exist politically, culturally or socially and the belief in the rationality of each individual. Above all else, liberalism takes the right of the individual over the group" (Goldberg,1993:5). However, even as the individual is given precedence over the group, it is assumed that the individual carries within him certain group ideals.

To investigate the logic that drives the construction of Native culture and which is then uncritically ascribed to all individuals of First Nation(s) groups, it is necessary to investigate the ways in which the moral has been deployed to justify and account for the perceived incongruency between Native culture and Western education. To illustrate just how long this "normative" standard has been used to distinguish the "First Nation group" from the "Euro-Canadian group" and the moral grounds on which this exclusion was based, I offer the observations of Father Le Jeune, a Jesuit Priest who lived in the 1600s. In Volume Six of *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents, Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France, 1610 - 1791*(Thwaites, 1897a) there is a interesting chapter that outlines the general characteristics of the "Sauvage". The writer observes that the physical attributes of the Sauvage are superior and the mind and souls of good quality. He also notes that they have neither ambition nor avarice, have a patience that far surpasses the French, take compassionate care of one another and abound with generousity. However, at the end of his commentary Le Jeune proclaims,

> It will be seen in the course of this relation, that all I have said in this chapter is very true; and yet I would not dare to assert that I have seen one act of real moral virtue in a Sauvage"(241).

Morals, values, beliefs, which make up a "cultural" value system are key in a society for defining the ways individuals perceive others and conceive of themselves. Morals provide a large part of the foundation for our personal identity. They provide the grounds for our social relations and rationalize and legitimate our acts to ourselves or others. The particular deterministic construction of culture embedded in these articles along with a great deal of Native educational discourse, not only bestows on to it the status of social fact but social fact which contains within it a high degree of moral significance.

The moral "other" upon which we construct ourselves is usually characterized in behavioural terms (whether illusionary or real) as a set of social attitudes, actions, and activities.[4] In present Native educational discourse, moral standards are often tied to pathology. The marginal conditions of First Nation(s) groups are often interpreted as a result of the different moral standards that underwrite their culture. In Native educational literature, this incompatible cultural morality often becomes interpreted as the cause for individual social pathology[5]. Ryan repeatedly refers to this connection between cultural morals and social pathology in his article.

---

[4] Little (1991:215) notes that, "moral relativism is the view that different cultures embody different and incompatible systems of moral values".

[5] This nineteenth-century notion is based on an analogy between organic disease or pathology and social deviance (Dictionary of Sociology,1984:227).

> Missionaries characterized Innut against other moral standards. They portrayed those who did not follow their teachings as heathens, they considered shamans to be devils, and drinkers, worthless drunks. State officials of various sorts saw Innut as lazy, childlike, and eventually criminal for engaging in traditional pursuits such as hunting caribou, an activity that the state subsequently declared illegal.

It is, as Ogbu (1974:256) explains, a rationale that sees the adherence to a different universal social system of values and beliefs as the cause for pathological social conditions.

Meritocratic Ideology in Education

Intimately tied to this type of cultural determinist reading in Ryan and Foreman's articles and an issue I discussed in Chapter Four, is the Western liberal educational ideological premise of meritocracy or equal opportunity. It is ideology which insists that the educational system is the main vehicle by which societal meritocracy will be meted out to the worthy and that these individuals, by their diligence, hard work and educational knowledge, will reap the benefits. In a meritocratic society, social positions in the occupational structure are to be filled on the basis of merit in terms of universal criteria of achievement, not on ascribed criteria of age, sex or inherited wealth. In this, "liberalism takes itself to be committed to equality" (Goldberg,1993:5). Liberal ideology is thus key in establishing the basis for the myth of "equal opportunity".

However, while the idea of "equality of opportunity" is premised on the liberal ideological notions of the rights of the individual it is also premised on the belief that these rights are underwritten by certain group universals. Thus the meritocratic "ideal" in education finds itself faced with the inevitable problem of securing an objective measurement of talent independently of inherited advantages. Foreman and Ryan's analysis of the Native educational situation, reflects the usual way this meritocratic problem of objective measurement is handled in Native educational discourse. Rather than examining the inherited cultural advantages of the general Euro-Canadian school population, they focus on the inherited cultural disadvantages of the Native population. It is the "equality of opportunity" ideology embedded in these articles which in a sense allows Foreman and Ryan no other recourse than to read First Nation(s) individuals as responsible for their lack of educational success vis-a-vis universal cultural normative culpability. To do so, they fall back on the argument that insists on the need for a certain set of universal normative guidelines to be held by the individual as an a priori condition to accessing educational meritocracy. In effect, this insistence conveniently paralyses and excludes First Nation(s) agency in education. Put slightly differently, the individual is filtered through a differentiated universal moral framework which is read as the cause for the identified pathology which in turn is seen to cause educational inaccessibility and the resulting social inequality.

Cultural Paralysis

There is for all intents and purposes an illusory connection in this type of analysis between the notion of "equality of opportunity" and the moral which takes its direction from a superficial reading of visible societal indicators. The inscription of cultural "difference" embedded within in these articles significantly paralyses and negates the educational possibilities of First Nation(s) individuals. An investigation into this discursive posture and its promotion of educational paralysis moreover reveals two apparently different readings of these First Nation values, morals etc. As Bernstein (1976:113) suggests, "... the connection between the factual base and valuation is built-in, as it were to the conceptual structure of these theories. The adoption of a framework of explanation carries with it the adoption of the 'value slope' implicit in it".

Positive Exclusions

The first type of "value slope" embedded in this discursive writing of the First Nation(s) "other" is exemplified by Foreman's construction of First Nation(s) people. Recall that Foreman argues that it is divergent values and norms reflected in the distinct learning styles of First Nation(s) groups that are largely responsible for cultural dissonance between First Nation(s) students and Western pedagogy. In contrasting Western learning styles with that of Native learning styles she observes,

> Education...of Indian people was participative and dynamic and involving the total community at every level of community life, every day all day. Learners, often considered "empty vessels" in Western cultures, are in Native cultures, respected as persons from an early age, with all the rights and responsibilities of any other member of the community (Foreman,1993:563).

Indeed, her entire pedagogical argument turns on the suggestion that all that is required to improve education for Native students is an alternate pedagogical approach to knowledge based on the identifiable different learning styles of First Nation(s) individuals. Foreman typecasts First Nation(s) within universal categories, which, while claiming to celebrate difference simply produce a social/cultural inertia driven by ideologically driven notions of universal "traditional" values of Native culture.

Implicit in this posture is the inscription of liberal ideology which presupposes that all social arrangements may be rectified by rational reform. Moral, political, economic and cultural progress is to be brought about by and reflected in carefully planned institutional improvement. This liberalism is reflected in Foreman's suggestion that all that is really needed is to improve education for Native students, is to tidy up the ragged edges of the educational system by accommodating First Nation(s) learning styles. New and improved, this pedagogy she postulates will "fix" the situation simply by linking a multicultural curriculum with a learning style more in keeping with Native values.

Unlike Ryan, Foreman subsumes system to agency, never acknowledging the socio-political historical context of First Nation(s) peoples nor the irony of her social reformist position. This avoidance of issues of domination and power in education is referred to by Sarup (1991:30/31) as soft multicultural education.

> Within certain versions of 'multicultural' curricula the pedagogical imperative is directed simply toward the encouragement of a liberal appreciation for cultural idiosyncrasies. The structural scaffolding of political and economic domination remains uninvestigated and uncriticized in these programs. Much of this 'soft' multicultural education is tokenistic, but it is more than that as it is involved in an ideological struggle that actually tries to prevent radical social change...Its aim is to prevent basic changes in the power structure of society.

Negative Exclusions

In James Ryan's reading of Native education, he devotes a considerable amount of time to documenting the negative perceptions held by those who interpret the Innu's failure to adjust and adapt to Euro-Canadian society as pathological. He notes that it is Euro-Canadian's perceptions of First Nation(s) cultural values that support the often hostile perceptions of the Innut.

> Many non-Innut characterize Innut as lazy because of their inability and/or unwillingness to take up permanent nine-five jobs....Innut are also branded as drunks ... The infiltration of these norms leaves marks on the young of both sexes in many ways. Rocky, a young Innut man, explained that he felt "bad" because he was unemployed (Ryan 1989:391).

These indeed, are often the negative cultural moral traits associated by the dominant society with Native populations in general. However, at no time does Ryan critically reflect on the similarity between the argument he extends and that which he attempts to deflate. The cultural "value slope" embedded in his defense is transcribed in the same denigrating context as that of those he identifies as "outsiders". In linking such factors as employability with traditional subsistence organizational strategies, it can be argued that he asserts the same line of reasoning as those who mark First Nation(s) individuals as socially degenerate. Ryan's assertion that the Innut are unable to find or hold a job because of cultural values embedded in organization dissimilarities freezes and reifies Innu culture in much the same way as those who cast First Nation(s) individuals as unemployable because they are pathological drunks.

By essentializing and contextualizing the Innut in this manner, he simply supports the underlying dominant historical, cultural and political interests located within this master narrative. Moreover, Ryan accomplishes this ideological construction of the Innut by subsuming agency to system through a modernist interpretation of the Foucauldian notion of discipline. By obliterating agency, Ryan's paper grounds itself in "liberal" despair for the "fate" of the other. This even though Foucault himself maintains that, "one should not assume a massive and primal condition of domination, a binary structure with 'dominator' on one side and 'dominated' on the other"(cited in Sarup,1989:80). However, by basing his argument of disciplinary apparatuses within an assimilationist cultural framework, Ryan sets up exactly this kind of binary condition of dominating/dominated. Based on the grounds of conflictual cultural organizational strategies, he writes this Innu community as one without hope or a future.

Ryan and Foreman do no more than document and rewrite the pervasive argument for the explicit significance of the discontinuity between the "value slope" of Western education and First Nation(s) cultures. Like their modernist predecessors, they also continue to couple meritocratic ideology with cultural determinism, justifying the marginal position in which First Nation(s) find themselves. They quite conveniently hold the discourse to the terms of a debate, the "regime of truth" already long established (Chapter Four). Their arguments are neither adversarial nor polemic but accomplices in maintaining the framework of the debate, both in the manner in which they construct and evaluate the "other" and in their monocausal linkage of the "other" to education. As Bourdieu (1990:184) argues, "... in leaving out the very game that constitutes them as competitors, adversaries become accomplices, agreeing to keep concealed the essential thing, that is, the interests attached to the fact of participating in the game and the objective collusion which results therefrom".

The Authoritative Voice

The absence of critical reflection in these articles is not only evident in the central premises that Ryan and Foreman take up to construct their "cultural other" but in the voice they use to do so. Evident in both articles is a neo-colonial discursive posture that insists on writing and defining the "other" on the modernist theoretical terrain in ways that continue to justify the continual oppression of First Nation(s) peoples through the production of a master narrative of social knowledge about the "other" from a Euro-centric sociohistorical location. The examples that follow demonstrate how through both Ryan and Foreman's voices, ideological meaning and academic discursive force intersect to produce an unreflective and uncritical modernist construction of knowledge.

> The Innu will be forced to take on at least some and probably all, aspects of our disciplinary society... when the time comes it will be up to them to look for ways to minimize the *inevitably* negative consequences (Ryan, 1989: 399, emphasis added).

Ryan simply deploys Foucault's disciplinary notion as a theoretical means to portray, as does other macrosystemic analysis, all Innu as being victims of systemic constraints. In rationalizing both his own position and that of the Innu, Ryan demonstrates a colonizing ideology. A colonizing ideology in this sense, is a set of rationalizations by which the colonizer explains his position in the colonized country, his superior status and his behaviour towards the Native (Richer, 1982:505).

Foreman's position, while equally Euro-centric takes on a different discursive tactic. It is a voice that insists on the insertion of a Western ideological notion of democracy, which she claims is both empowering and liberating. Foreman's call to democracy is voiced through her insistence to adopt a multicultural approach which calls upon us all to celebrate our "equally" valid partial knowledges. Roman (1993:164) quite rightly argues however, that "there are dangerous implications in a discourse that fails to locate its own perspective in celebrating the indeterminancy of knowledge or reality and in which all reality claims are treated as representing equally valid accounts of the social world". Foreman also uses this theoretical position to advocate for tolerance for "others". However, I am inclined to argue that the idea of tolerance is one that points to Canadian society's ideological disposition to intolerance. Susan Mendus (1989:149) writes, "tolerance (as a superior term) presupposes that its object is morally repugnant, that it really needs to be reformed, that is, altered".

Finally, Foreman's view of society as a homogenous meritocratic society rather than one marked and stratified along cultural lines, is a neo-colonial voice that simply contributes to the paternalistic treatment of First Nation(s) groups, writing them as though they were independent cultural units in contact with a single wider society. Since the beliefs of a meritocratic society and the existence of permanently excluded groups are contradictory, it is quite convenient to rationalize the persistence of the peripheral position of First Nation(s) groups by accepting a view that places them outside Canadian society. By presenting the "data" from the dominant position of Euro-Canadians, the authoritative voices of Foreman and Ryan simply add to the already large Euro-centric colonial base of literature in the field of Native education. In Foucault's own words on organized claims to insight, "my point is not that everything is bad, but that everything dangerous, which is not exactly the same as bad" (cited in Luke and Gore 1992:143). And, in Ryan and Foreman's superficial application of postmodern theoretical principles they are dangerous. Ultimately this cultural deterministic position in the explanatory equation of culture/pathology denies and excludes those identified as part of the particular cultural milieu being addressed, for it is not they but others who are defining who they are and what they represent at either a symbolic and/or individual level.

In deconstructing Foreman and Ryan's articles, it becomes possible to understand more fully Foucault's contention that discursive "regimes of truth" are based on relations of power where the ability to construct and define the "other" in ways that fit into an already established frame suit the rather interested purposes of the discourse rather than anything that remotely reflects the reality of those so "constructed". Power and meaning intersect and are exercised in the dual practices of naming and evaluating. "There is, as Said makes clear no Other behind or beyond the invention of knowledge in the Other's name. These specific practices of knowledge construction deny all autonomy to those so named and imagined, extending power, control and authority and domination over them" (Goldberg,1993:150)

Both Ryan and Foreman quite clearly write First Nation(s) peoples on modernist terrain. Their claims to postmodern theory are firmly entrenched on foundational premises that discursively construct First Nation(s) "others" upon modernist cultural determinist terrain. Whether couched in terms of incompatible organizational systems, knowledge bases or pedagogical approaches, both Foreman and Ryan provide the reader with the construction of stereotyped markers that imprint on our minds the image of those who do not belong. I concur with Luke (1992:49) when she writes,

> There is then a need I suggest, to pay critical attention to those contemporary educational narratives that claim to be emancipatory, ideologically critical, self-reflexive and politically conscientious, and yet remain theoretically entrenched in Western liberalism.

Meaning, Power and Discourse

The fundamental flaw in cultural determinist discourse is that it is driven by an outdated model of culture which overlooks how change takes place and how culture exists as a product of the socio-political relations of the participants. It is a model that "provides no room for the survival of First Nations cultures" (Urion,1991:4). Urion and others like him who have critiqued Native educational literature as a discourse, have offered some insightful and prophetic analysis. In 1976, Hedley (1976: 9) wrote,

> The fact that the critical attention given acculturation studies did not challenge their underlying framework suggest that an explanation of their failure lies in the fact that anthropologists neglected to direct their criticisms at the framework itself.... *A drawback of this approach to theory is that failure to identify the reason behind poor results increases the probability that the same mistakes will occur again* (emphasis added).

If as these individuals suggest, the Native educational discourse is simply reproducing itself upon this cultural determinist framework, then the fact that Urion (1991) still sees the discourse as non-cumulative and poorly developed is well warranted. It also raises an important question. Why does the discourse continue to contextualize the debate around this framework rather than examining the framework upon which it rests?

The next section of this chapter will venture into what I consider to be heart of cultural determinist discourse. It is an investigation that seeks through an analysis of the embedded ideology, to unveil the relationship between truth and knowledge and power. If the critique of ideology in discourse analysis basically concerns itself with the multiple ways meaning and force intersect and intertwine themselves both inside and outside the text, then the question becomes how to discover what the effects of a particular kind of discourse are and how they are tied into certain notions of power, knowledge and authority. Taking up the critical language of ideological theory, I will argue that Native educational discourse does not reflect First Nation(s) "culture" in any meaningful way, but tells us a great deal about Euro-Canadian "culture" and its power and authority to define "others". I do so taking up Bourdieu's (1990:20) suspicions: "I was beginning to suspect that the privilege granted to scientific and objectivist analysis in genealogical research, for example, in dealing with the native's vision of things, was perhaps an ideology inherent in the profession".

It is crucial to point out before I begin that the deconstruction of the ideological composition of knowledge, authority and power relationships in Native educational discourse is neither monolithic nor absolute in its representation of the real power relationships embedded in the life experiences of real people. Rather, it is an approach that seeks to mark and clarify the ways in which the power of Euro-Canadian society impacts with meaning in Native educational discourse to rationalize and legitimize the embedded relations of power.

The Ideology of Difference

In order to untangle the prevailing conceptualization of First Nation(s) "culture" that has shaped and written the discourse as well as unravelling some not-so-obvious purposes that this discourse serves, I will offer a discussion directed towards some of the ideological undercurrents running through the governing Native educational discourse. I begin with a notion of Foucault's, who maintains that knowledge is a power over others, the power to define others (Sarup,1991:73). Exposing the origins of the Euro-centric discursive power to define the other lies in asking a few simple questions. What is the Euro-centric purpose of examining and trying to explain 'other' cultures? Is it to understand Euro-centric Canadian culture better and or is it simply to understand 'other' cultures better?

Historically, the study of First Nation(s) cultures may have come about as a means of answering these seemingly innocent questions. However, much of the "cultural" information generated produced theory and research that failed to build into the work any consideration of the social and historical position from which it was written (Goldberg, 1993). One of the indices of this absence is reflected in the initial claim of cultural determinist theory to be interested in the interaction between two cultures. This being the case, it would seem reasonable to expect that analysis would direct itself towards both First Nation(s) and Euro-Canadian culture. However, "in Native educational discourse an analysis of both cultures has by and large never been forthcoming. Instead, the acculturation studies of North American Indians have been based on the assumption that analysis should be limited to one system; only the aboriginal one" (Chaiton, 1977:9).

This was based on the belief of early anthropologists that their discipline was objective and able to abstract unbiased true "facts" about First Nation(s) culture. However, as (Chaiton, 1977:9) points out,

> ...generally anthropologists seemed to accept the contradictory belief that in collecting ethnographic data they could emancipate themselves from cognitive preconceptions and collect 'pure facts'. This despite the fact that early anthropologists considered one of the major benefits gained by studying other cultures was that it could then provide a basis from which to ***understand the cognitive limitations of one's own culture.***

It is the "cognitive limitations" of the Euro-centric collective, specifically its own inability to analyze critically its own sociohistorical position, that provides an opening. Euro-centric invisibility becomes a place to start investigating cultural determinism as a concept where the pervading meaning is moulded through various ideological devices.

I want to suggest that it is certain ideological devices that have, in a sense, ensured the cognitive limitations of those in the position to define and study the "other" and in doing so, have worked to sustain underlying relations of domination. Eagleton(1991:5) identifies five ideological strategies which he suggests are instrumental in establishing and sustaining these relations of domination: 1) A dominant power may *legitimate* itself by promoting beliefs and values congenial to it 2) *naturalize and universalize* such beliefs so as to render them self-evident and apparently inevitable 3) *denigrate* ideas which might challenge it 4) *exclude* rival forms of thought perhaps by some unspoken but systematic logic, and 5) *obscure* social reality in ways convenient to itself. Even though Eagleton (1991) separates these ideological strategies into identifiable strands he also notes that in any actual ideological formation, all five of these strategies are likely to interact in complex ways.

Ideological Strategies and the Construction of Culture

Native educational discourse is limited by a discursive construction which presents First Nation(s) reality in terms of the first instance of ideological definition; the ideological discourse of difference located in Native educational literature is one that presents cultural difference as often no more than benign variation or diversity. Raymond Guess (cited in Eagleton,1991:43) argues that in the descriptive or anthropological sense,

> ideologies are belief-systems characteristic of certain social groups of classes, composed of both discursive and non-discursive elements. This politically innocuous definition of ideology comes close to the notion of a 'world view' in the sense of a relatively

> well-systematized set of categories which provide a 'frame' of the belief, perception and conduct of a body of individuals.

Recall Assheton-Smith's description of acculturation theory based on a notion of culture as "a set of idealized beliefs, or values upon which social relations (or social structure) are based" (Chapter 4:21) and the similarity between ideologies in the descriptive sense and cultural description in Native educational discourse becomes apparent. Both claim that cultures can be described in terms of general categories based on certain values and beliefs.

A general overview of this type of social construction suggests that the most visible of the ideological strategies that serve to inform Native educational discourse are those of ***naturalization*** and ***universalization***. The essentialist based arguments in Native educational discourse, which claim the possibility of obtaining absolute irrefutable knowledge of the essence of an object, are firmly grounded in the ideological strategies of naturalization and universalization. They are arguments which claim that "natural differences" impact universally on the First Nation(s) group's ability to access and progress in the educational system.

For instance, it is through this ideological construction of inevitable *natural* differences that essentialist arguments seek to demonstrate connections between First Nation(s) conflicts with Euro-centric education and naturally inherent differentiated patterns of socialization, child-rearing practices, family structures values, preferences, and expectations. In acculturation terminology, this "common sense" of cultural essentialism becomes read as definable, identifiable behaviours of the individual filtered through the naturalization of marked universal categories. Underlying this discursive construction of cultural characteristics and behaviour is the naturalization of differences in First Nation(s) peoples cognitive, linguistic and learning ability and strategies. In neither the naturalization of social/cultural formation nor cultural cognitive differentiation is there any question that these identified "differences" could or should be anything but what they are. Eagleton (1991:57) points out that, "successful ideologies are often thought to render their beliefs natural and self-evident, to identify them with the 'common sense' of a society so that nobody could imagine how they might be different".

Overlapping and enmeshed with this ideological strategy of naturalization in Native educational discourse is that of universalization. Universalization is an ideological device which projects specific values and interests as being eternal rather than tied to a particular time, place and group of people. In Native educational discourse, this universalization takes root through the representation of First Nation(s) peoples as a homogeneous group. It is an ideological strategy that objectifies First Nation(s) as a singular collective whose values, interests and adaptive strategies are marked not only by exclusionary cultural insularity but also by limited possibility.

Both ideological discursive strategies of universalization and naturalization in cultural deterministic discourse significantly contribute to what is known as the ***dehistorizing*** thrust of ideology. It is a strategy which ensures that the significant history of First Nation(s) societies and individuals is one written in a frozen past. This freezing of history is essentially a reification of social life that disconnects First Nation(s) groups from the socio-historical, and denies First Nation(s) peoples visibility except as either passive recipients of the acts of others or as people only capable of reacting to those acts. Despite the fact that First Nation(s) groups have contested their position at various points in history, it is a mark of their subordinate standing that they have been denied status as historical actors. Any rights they have won have been recorded for history as rights they have been granted by benevolent rulers, employers, and politicians. Haig-Brown (1995:50) illustrates this limited visibility of First Nation(s) peoples: "although the National Indian Brotherhood (NIB) document (1973), is often cited as the first expression of concern about education it is actually only a notable event in a long history of First Nation(s) interventions". This type of historical transcript is an index of the relations of power that exist both in the lived reality of First Nation(s) individuals and in the discourse that writes them. Cultural determinism provides the ideological scaffolding in Native educational discourse from which its theorists are able to rationalize, legitimize, and authorize the perpetual linkage between specific notions of First Nation(s) cultural "difference" and the conflictual relationship with education. In making "Native" the central focus in the discourse, those who use the concept of cultural determinism as the basis for their work neglect to inquire into the position and location from which their notions of moral duality, cultural "difference" and structural restraint have been socially constructed. Never addressed is the way these constructions might be ideologically organized to entrench Euro-centric power and authority.

The underlying difficulties in "naturalizing" and "universalizing" the differences of First Nation(s) individuals are two-fold. First in fitting experience into already defined categories there is a failure to analyze or make sense of what does not fit. What about First Nation(s) people who hold Ph.D.'s, operate their own businesses and have generally succeeded in the Euro-Canadian milieu? Second, naturalizing, universalizing and freezing Native educational history bypasses questions of power. In ignoring the cultural determinist "regime of truth" upon which it is built, the governing discourse in Native education obscures the fundamental question of how or why First Nation(s) collectives have come to be naturalized, universalized and relegated to a distant past in the first place.

In this chapter, taking up the Derridean discursive technique of deconstruction and Foucault's notion of "regimes of truth", I have tried to demonstrate how pervasive the cultural determinist concept is in Native educational discourse. In deconstructing and critically analyzing the educational and cultural frameworks embedded in this discourse, I have argued that it is certain ideological strategies which drive both the educational and cultural theory being employed by the prevalent discourse in Native education. I have done so in order to illustrate how wearing new theoretical clothes does not necessarily advance a discipline and to stress the importance of critically analyzing the conceptual frameworks on which we build our theory and practice.

Chapter Six

Once Upon a Time

We call the musical idea presented at the beginning of counterpoint music its "theme".

(Owen, 1992:202)

Thought Woman is walking. It is morning and Thought Woman is walking. So Thought Woman walks to the river. Hello, says Thought Woman to the river. Hello, says that River. Nice day for a walk. Are you warm today? says Thought Woman. Yes, says that River, I am very warm. Then I believe I will have a bath, says Thought Woman. That is one good idea, says that River, and that River stops flowing so Thought Woman can get in. So that Thought Woman takes off her nice clothes, and that one gets into the River. Whoa! says Thought Woman. That is one cold river. This must be a tricky River. Swim to the middle, says that tricky River. It is much warmer there. So Thought Woman swims to the middle of that river, and that one goes to sleep. I am very sleepy, says Thought Woman, and then she goes to sleep. Hee-hee, says that River. Hee-hee.

"Hmmmmm," says Coyote. "I don't like the sound of that." "Maybe that River reminds you of someone," I says. "Who?" says Coyote. "Never mind," I says. "More important things to worry about." "Yes," says Coyote. "For example, what happened to Old Coyote?" "Old Coyote is fine," I says. "But

Thought Woman is floating away." "Hmmmmm," says Coyote. "I don't like the sounds of that".

When that River starts flowing again, it flows real fast. It flows around those rocks, and it flows past those trees. Look out, says those Rocks, here comes Thought Woman. And those Rocks climb out of the river and sit on the Bank. Wake up, wake up, says those Trees. You are floating away. But Thought Woman's ears are under water, and she doesn't hear those Rocks and she doesn't hear those Trees. Oh, well, says those Rocks. Too bad. They say that, too. And those Rocks dive into the River and swim around until they find a nice spot to sit.

La, la, la, la, says that River, and it keeps going faster and faster. And pretty soon it is going very fast. It goes so fast, it goes right off the edge of the world. Ooops, say that River. But it is too late. Thought Woman floats right out of that River and into the sky (King, 1993:193/194).

Race and Ideology

The preceding analysis of Native educational discourse suggests that its boundaries are well established and severely limited in scope and breadth. It is an analysis which also points to the need to ask questions of a different nature, questions that direct attention to power, knowledge and truth. As I have stated before, addressing the underlying relations between power, knowledge and truth means asking how and why a particular notion of culture came to be constructed and what and whose interests are being served by continually entering into the debate of Native education within this framework. Bourdieu(1990:138) observes that, "... the power of making visible and explicit social divisions that are implicit, is the political power par excellence: it is the power to make groups, to manipulate the objective structure of society".

The main objective of this chapter is to begin answering these questions. It is a chapter that traces the concept of culture back to its historical origins in order to seek out what Derrida defines as the discursive *"central premise"* : "any thought-system which depends on an unassailable foundation, a first principle or unimpeachable ground upon which a whole hierarchy of meaning may be constructed" (Chapter Three: 47). I will argue that this "central premise" is *not* located in the concept of culture but in the concept of race. Through an investigation of the concept of race and its history, I will detail the racialized nature of the prevailing Native educational discourse and argue that the ideological nature of cultural determinist discourse is based on a Neo-Darwinist "theme" of physiology and environmental adaptation.

The Concept of Culture

I begin this investigation of the historical origins of culture by drawing attention to the advent of the term itself. The conceptualization of culture as a social construction is a relatively recent paradigm, occurring roughly around the time of World War Two. Perhaps not surprisingly, the atrocities of Hitler's supremacist regime coincide with an European and American philosophical shift from racial to cultural categorizations in the construction of the "other": "Before World War Two...race was still largely seen in Europe and North America as an essence, a natural phenomenon, whose meaning was fixed, constant as a southern star" (Omi & Winant,1993:3). It is only after World War Two that language, group customs, religion and world views start to become central to the culling and cultivation of the ideology of difference.

Despite the apparent shift in emphasis from race to culture on the philosophical and theoretical landscape of Native educational discourse, an in-depth investigation of this cultural paradigm will prove otherwise; the shift to culture has been superficial. Rather than any real change occurring in the socio-historical configurations of race theory, cultural deterministic discourse carries on with the original racist theme. In short, the paradigm shift from race to culture does no more than divert attention away from the coherence of ideologies assembled through the already embedded notion of race.

Key Words

A good place to begin exploring this argument is in the definition of some of the "key" words so often associated with First Nation(s) peoples for a great many of them carry meaning tied to race rather then culture. For example, **primitive society** (Dictionary of Sociology, 1988:195) is defined as follows: "In evolutionary anthropology, primitive societies represented a particular stage from which more complex societies developed. The term often implied that modern man was more intelligent than his savage, irrational forebears....In sociology, there is a preference for alternative terms such as 'pre-capitalist' or '**traditional society**'. The term is commonly used in juxtaposition to modern, urban, industrial society; *many of the judgmental implications of 'primitive' are still carried over into such allegedly neutral descriptions as 'traditional' society"*(emphasis added).

The Dictionary of Sociology (201) defines **racism** "as the determination of actions, attitudes or policies by beliefs about racial characteristics. Racism may be overt and individual, involving individual acts of oppression against subordinate racial groups or individuals or covert and institutional, involving structural relations of subordination and oppression between social groups. While individual racism consists of intended actions, institutional racism involves the unintended consequences of a system of racial inequality. *Racism may be accompanied by either implicit or explicit racist* *theories, which seek to explain and justify social inequality based on race*"(emphasis added).

Another word directly connected to racism is **stereotype** (242) which is defined as "a one-sided, exaggerated and normally prejudicial view of a group, tribe or class of people, and is usually associated with **racism.** Stereotypes are often resistant to change or correction from countervailing evidence, because they create a sense of social solidarity. Sociologists have long used the notion in the analysis of deviant behaviour and of race relations". The word **stigma** (243) is defined as "a social attribute which is discrediting for an individual or group. Stigma theories explain or justify the exclusion of stigmatized persons from normal social interaction". **Prejudice** (194) is "a term usually used in the literature on race relations to denote an individual attitude of antipathy or active hostility against another social group, *usually racially defined*. Prejudice, often the object of psychological study, is to be contrasted with **discrimination** which refers to the outcome of social processes which disadvantage social groups *racially defined*"(emphasis added). Finally the word **ethnocentrism** (90) is one "used to describe prejudicial attitudes between in-groups and out-groups by which *our attitudes, customs and behaviour are unquestionably and uncritically treated as superior to their social arrangements*"(emphasis added). In my view, the correlation these definitions have to the concept of race is significant.

Glimpses of the racialized current driving cultural determinism are caught by Urion (1995:198), who notes in his review of Native educational literature that, "... it might be said that *racism is a footnote throughout the literature*, yet no studies were found that directly and solely address the incidence and extent of campus racism involving First Nations people", and by Celia Haig-Brown (1995:238) who comments that, "people at NEC (Native Education Centre) often spoke to me of their experience of *culture clash, primarily a euphemism for racism*"(emphasis added).

It may be that the reader will answer this claim with "so what"? Everybody is prejudiced to some degree, we all stereotype certain individuals and we are all ethnocentric in that we perceive our own groups to be superior on some level to others. And this may be so. However, this type of answer conveniently misses a very crucial point for it *fails to take into consideration the relation between a social position and its material conditions of possibility*. "Oppression in short", says Eagleton "is a normative concept: someone is being oppressed not simply if they drag out a wretched existence but if certain creative capacities they could feasibly realize are being actively thwarted by the unjust interests of others" (1991:15). Racism is oppressive for it perpetuates a social system in which some people are consistently "haves" and others are consistently "have nots".

The master narrative of cultural determinism in Native educational discourse, by successfully obscuring any other type of relationship except one framed in terms of two groups clashing because of dissonant cultural positions, becomes the common-sense and dissimulating answer to the unsavory social realities of prejudice, stigma, ethnocentrism and racism. It not only becomes an acceptable reply but provides a justifiable rationalization for the relative positions of the two groups. In this, racism written as cultural determinism allows Native educational discourse to view current injustices as "natural" or at best inevitable and in doing so denies the possibility of change or justice. However, cultural determinism is an answer that mystifies the historical, political and social relationship between the colonizer and the colonized.

Furthermore, submerging racially constituted ideological stances within cultural determinism allows racism to become a non-issue in the literature. The ideological nature of the cultural determinist master narrative in Native educational discourse rests firmly within the boundaries of race rather than culture and so must be approached as such.

> Racism in education is very complex and far-reaching in its impact and ultimate effects. Thus the deconstruction of racist practice must be direct and at a conscious level. It is dangerous if not downright racist to concentrate on something else, like culture for example, and hope that the rest will follow (Brandt,1986:71).

To begin investigating the racist ideological terrain of cultural determinist theory in Native educational discourse, requires no more than a simple reversal. It is a difficult gesture for it calls on us to makes Euro-Canadian culture rather than Native culture the central focus of analysis. The effort required to explore cultural determinism from this perspective while perhaps unfamiliar and difficult, is one worth making because it provides a venue from which to critically analyze Native educational discourse. As Fusco,(1988:9) argues "to ignore white ethnicity is to redouble its hegemony by naturalizing it. Without specifically addressing white ethnicity there can be no critical evaluation of the discourse". By making "Euro-centric culture" the focus of the inquiry, it becomes possible to investigate Euro-centric ideologies that shape and mould this discourse in complex, subtle ways. However as Thompson (1984:188) reminds us, "The critique of ideology is only a moment- albeit an important moment in the endless hermeneutical task of renewing and appraising our social-historical heritage".

I also need to make clear that in my effort to identify the ideological strategies used to construct and depict "culture" in Native educational discourse, I am *not* making an argument for Marx's conceptualization of "false consciousness", where some ideas of "culture" match or correspond to the way things are while others do not. As Eagleton (1991:15) points out ," ... successful ideologies must be more than imposed illusions and for all their inconsistencies must communicate to their subjects a version of social reality which is real and recognizable enough not to be simply rejected out of hand". Rather, I seek to expose the way in which cultural determinist discourse in Native education is bound to pejorative ideological strategies which ensure the power and legitimation of certain interests. In this I am arguing that the cultural determinist "theme" in Native educational discourse is built upon historically ingrained racist ideas culled by Enlightenment philosophy and science.

> ***... in the pejorative sense ideological strategies are to be viewed critically because they have been generated by ideas contaminated at their root. Genetically flawed these ideas and beliefs have given birth to massive social illusion and breed effects which help to legitimate an unjust form of power***
> (Guess, 1981:13, emphasis added).

The Construction of Race

To disentangle the racially inscribed ideological discourse authorized by cultural determinism, I begin by tracing the historical genesis of the concept of "race". I then discuss how the ideological strategies of universalization, naturalization and ahistoricity embedded the concept of race, have served to construct, in a dissimulating sense, both Euro-Canadian and First Nation(s) identity. My intent is to demonstrate how the concept of "race" has been designed to construct and privilege the Euro-centric collective identity. This includes an analysis of how the Euro-centric racially constituted conceptualization of the "other" necessarily turns on certain "preconceptualizations" indispensable to its own construction and identity formation. As Crichlow and McCarthy (1993:xxvii) argue, "...the study of 'race' must not exclude the study of 'whiteness' as though it were a category that stands, unmarked, outside of history. We must also work toward the dissolution of whiteness as a 'transparent racial identity'". It is only by making present, this category of "whiteness", that some understanding of how the educational explanations and practices put forth by Native educational discourse are predicated on certain ideas, concepts, and generalizations that define a distinctive Euro-centric method of objectifying and interpreting the world.

As my starting point, I take up Foucault's critical conception of power as a relationship characterized not only by domination but by its capacity to enable the formation of discourse. Knowledge and power are not merely related; they constitute one another. Power creates knowledge and conversely knowledge induces effects of power. Foucault (1980:51) writes,

> Mechanisms of power in general have never been much studied by history. History has studied those who held power...But power in all its strategies, at once general and detailed, and in its mechanisms has never been studied. What has been studied even less is the relation between power and knowledge, the articulation of each other.

Foucault's genealogy of power is a form of inquiry which suggests that knowledge itself is rooted in power relations. If knowledge is rooted in power relations, the concept of "race" is one place where power has been articulated in the discursive formation of the self and other. Race writes Goldberg (1993:3) is "one of the central conceptual inventions of modernity".

The Emergence of Nationhood

The historical origins of the concept of race began roughly around the eighteenth century. There was at this time, a drive by the European empire to expand its imperial territory. Moreover, this territorial expansion was legitimated by a cultural mythology that morally sanctioned the exploitation of other lands and people: It was a mythology constructed in the historical formation of what we presently call the West and emerges "... as and in terms of a broad sweep of sociointellectual conditions" (Goldberg,1993:3). This European mythology was constructed out of a number of intersecting philosophical positions in European thought. These philosophical positions included notions of continual progress, private property, economic advancement and national superiority based on the rational individual and scientific empiricism. Of these philosophical ideas, it was the concepts of nation superiority and scientific empiricism which gave birth to the concept of race and provided the necessary philosophical support for the Euro-centric political, social and economic expansionist forces.

It was also in these notions of nation superiority and scientific empiricism that the concepts of homogeneity and exclusivity so prevalent in Native educational discourse began to emerge. The first postulated that groups were fixed and invariable, the second that it was possible to ascribe definitive characteristics to whole groups of people. In other words, group inclusiveness was both established and reducible to characteristics considered unique to particular societies. Said (1993:308) writing to these two historically inscribed philosophical principles says, "At its core [imperialism] is the supremely stubborn thesis that everyone is principally and irreducibly a member of some race or category and that race or category cannot ever be assimilated to or accepted by others - except as itself".

The historically embedded notion of group exclusivity in European thought was not in itself particularly deleterious. However, imbued in this Euro-centric philosophical notion of identifiable groups, was the constituted value laden belief of nation superiority. If it was possible to identify particular societies by their unique characteristics, it was also possible, indeed desirable, vis-a-vis scientific empiricism to rank them accordingly. Not surprisingly, Western European societies were identified as those most advanced and therefore the most highly valued.

> ...the specificity of Euro-centrism as a certain prejudice or mythology was necessary for Europe to reconcile its supposed superiority with its universalist ambitions. Europe constructed its exceptionality not on the basis that the modern or capitalism-(although the two are not quite identical) was born there but rather that it could not have been born elsewhere (Grossberg, 1993:92).

In these two philosophical premises, that it was possible to categorize whole groups of people and rank these groups based on identifiable characteristics and behaviours according to value, lay the distorted yet powerful logic of the European expansionist policy. If particular societies could not only be marked as singular and autonomous, but also identified by varying degrees of "civilized" behaviour, then it becomes in the best interest of these "other" groups to be exposed to and governed by the more advanced progressive societies. As such, it became the responsibility of the more advanced societies to "help" the "wretched of the earth" enter the modern, progressive enlightened age. As Goldberg (1993:166) points out, "since its inception in the fifteenth century, the term 'progress' has assumed moral and cultural judgements of civilized superiority".

This philosophy however, had a peculiar logic to it for if groups could be identified by certain natural and fixed characteristics, and if these characteristics could be measured on an evolutionary scale from the "primitive" to the "civilized", it becomes impossible to bring the "other" group into the modern age. Put another way, constructed on a scale based on certain characteristics that defined and graded them as a independently evolved autonomous group, the "other" lacked the very characteristics deemed necessary to participate in "advanced" and "progressive" society. The collective characteristics the "other" group embodied were inadequate and inferior to the task of modernity and progress. These two conflicting assumptions, the first that it was necessary for the "other" to become like their more progressive brethren , the second that this was inherently impossible because of the fixed and eternal group characteristics which had been inscribed upon them, became part of the ideological terrain from which the expansionist perspective was built.

> It was the conjunction of these two conflicting assumptions - one that defined the local conditions of the possibility of the modern, the other that proposed to universalize the modern and to ignore

> local conditions which instituted and legitimated the unequal distribution of both power and value across space. And this inequality was produced both inside and outside of every nation-space colonized by capitalism (Grossberg, 1993:92).

It was these two ideas which served as the basis for the social construction of the "other" and that played an integral role in the historical development of Euro-centric racialized thought and discourse. Moreover, they provided the necessary rationale for those who advocated conquest and colonial violence. They justified expansionist policy on the grounds of bringing the superior civilized world to the uncivilized and by extension, sanctified the violation of the "other" for the "other's" own well being.

Scientific Empiricism

Lending support and legitimation to the philosophical conjectures of "Nation" building, was the European discipline of scientific empiricism. One of its central roles was to provide the necessary "proof" of the superiority of the "civilized" world. It was in the search for confirmation of Nation superiority that scientific empiricism and its penchant for classification and order became a significant contributor to the construction of race. While the categorization of phenomena had been practiced since the days of Aristotle, it was only in the seventeenth century that classification began to embody a valuation system within the ordering of information. Goldberg (1993:49) notes that,

> with its catalogues, indices, and inventories, classification establishes an ordering of data; it thereby systematizes observation. But it also claims to reflect the natural order of things. This ordering of representations accordingly always presupposes value: Nature ought to be as it is; it cannot be otherwise. So the seemingly naked body of pure facts is veiled in value.

Largely responsible for the generation of theory and research which established this classificatory order of racial collectives, were the independent scientific domains of anthropology and biology.[1] To categorize the human world, Enlightenment thinkers turned their attention to the physical and cultural characteristics embodied in the different groups of people being encountered in the European journeys. These physical and cultural characteristics were then arranged according to "race" on a scale of gradiated human evolutionary development. This gradiated scale utilized the enlightenment notions of "progress" and "civilization" as the standard from which to make sense of the new worlds. It was an attempt to scale the physical and cultural transformations of mankind from prehistoric "savagery" to "civilization" and a scale on which the European community took itself to be the highest representative.

In naming and evaluating the alien cultures Europeans were beginning to encounter, a catalogue of particular groups emerged simultaneously with a scaled classification of races. These embedded structuring principles, classification and gradation, organized and shaped the construction of "other" in terms of ordering and value. However as Goldberg(1993:50) astutely observes,

> It might be said that while classification enabled racial differentiation, it was the historically grounded derivation of order, value, and hierarchy that authorized the various forms of racial exclusions in the name of difference...*The principle of gradation is at once a principle of degradation*"(emphasis added).

In this naming and valuing of the "other", the European collective simultaneously named itself, inscribing itself with racial group identity. It was an inscription which marked the Euro-centric group as the standard against which every other human collective was to be measured. Its purpose in part was that in order to continue building and expanding its Nationhood, it needed a standard not just to measure "others" but to measure itself. Indeed, if there was no "other" to compare or contrast itself with, then it had no way of naming and evaluating itself as a group. And so, the rest of humanity becomes the identity markers from which the Western collective constructs, bounds and asserts itself as superior. It is here that the historical "theme" (the initial idea) in cultural determinist discourse is located. In marking itself off as isolated, autonomous, closed off to outsiders and by laying claim to definable and superior characteristics, the European collective began to write itself as a naturally and universally insular racially superior nation.

---

[1] Assuming common origin, biology set out in part to delineate the natural causes of human difference in terms primarily of climatic variation. Anthropology was intially concerned to catalog the otherness of cultural practices. However, as it became increasing identified as 'the science of peoples without history', anthropology turned primarily to estasblishing the physical grounds of difference (Goldberg,1993:29).

> the longevity of the race concept and the enormous number of effects race-thinking (and race-acting) have produced, guarantee that race will remain a feature of social reality across the globe, and a fortiori in our own country, despite its lack of intrinsic or scientific merit (in the biological sense) (Omi and Winant, 1993:5).

In naturalizing and universalizing the "Euro-centric" preferential location and identity, the manner in which "White" came to be constructed is apparent; it was against the backdrop of a racially standardized, secondary "other". As Hall (1991:21) writes, "identity is a structure of representation which only achieves its positive through the narrow eye of the negative. It has to go through the eye of the other before it can construct itself".

The Euro-centric ability to construct itself rests heavily on its ability to make itself both invisible and the superior term at the same time - to legitimate its power. For example, in Native educational cultural deterministic discourse if First Nation(s) "others" are constructed as naturally and universally "primitive" (read inferior), the

Euro-centric collective is constructed as naturally and universally "progressive" (read superior), if First Nation(s) "others" are naturally and universally predisposed to communality, Euro-centric "others" are naturally and universally predisposed to individualism, if First Nation(s) "others" are naturally and universally predisposed to mysticism and spirituality, Euro-centric "others" are naturally and universally predisposed to science and rational thought; if First Nation(s) peoples history lies in the universal past, then Euro-centric peoples history is naturally reflected by the universal present. Above these dichotomies emerges either a "natural being" whose image underpins the affirmation of a society submerged to nature and the past, or one whose image underpins the affirmation of a progressive society above nature and fully in the present.

Given this demonstration of how "binary oppositions" work within a central premise of a discourse, the concept of cultural "difference" in Native educational discourse can no longer be viewed in oppositional terms. In making visible the concepts involved in the construction of the term race, we begin to get some idea of how Euro-centric construction of itself is predicated upon and constituted in fundamental ways by its construction and representation of the "other". It is an interest vested construction which rests heavily on discourse that not only names and evaluates the "other" but coterminously names and evaluates Euro-centric society. Murphy (1993:25) writes,

> The 'binary oppositions' which compose the chain of signification are invariably constructed upon the assumed domination of one term by another...The second term in the binarism is understood as dependent on the first, being defined as its negation, absence or lack. What this suggests for the first term is that the meaning of the opposition originates within it.

Racialized Discourse and Native Education

In utilizing racial categorization as a means to insure differential exclusion, the Euro-centric concepts of naming and evaluating became of primary importance in the social construction of "others". I suggest that they have to this day remained the driving force in Native educational discourse. "If the concept of race was a child of modernity, racialized discourse became the medium of its dispersement, increasingly giving shape to the sociocultural order of modernity and furnishing the means of tying people, power, and history together"(Goldberg,1993:45). Racialized discourse served not only to rationalize already established social relations but also to order them and legitimize them in modern scientific theories.

Discursive Preconceptuals

Driving the racialized posture of cultural determinism in Native educational discourse are discursive "preconceptuals". "Preconceptuals are those underlying factors which directly generate the discursive field and which may be likened to 'primitive terms' in an artificial language" (Goldberg,1993:48). Preconceptual terms are manifestations of power relations vested in and between historically located subjects, and they are effects of a determinant social history. Theo Goldberg points out that it is these preconceptual terms that generate the concepts and categories embedded in racialized discourse: "Since the seventeenth century, elaboration of racial differences and identities has served as a leading mode of promoting exclusions and inclusions... ***Differential exclusion*** is the most basic primitive term of the deep structure underlying racist expressions"(1993:51). It is this preconceptual of "differential exclusion" that lies at the base of cultural determinism in Native educational discourse. Put another way, the social construction of First Nation(s) peoples as culturally determined in Native educational discourse does not consist simply in the seemingly innocent description of others. It includes a set of pre-given assertions about Euro-Canadian and First Nation(s) groups in terms of classification, hierarchy and the exclusionary differences (both social and physical) that exist between them . Goldberg(1993:49) claims that,

> ...the overall coherence of racialized expression and the racist project, rather, turns on the preconceptual elements structuring dispositions and the drawing of implications. These elements include classification, order, value and hierarchy; differentiation and identity, discrimination and identification; exclusion, domination, subjection and subjugation; as well as entitlement and restriction.

This *differential exclusion* preconceptual is found in much of Native educational discourse and tends to be determined by some essential cultural identity checklist based on innate differences. The perceived failure of First Nation(s) groups to advance or integrate within the educational sphere is attributed to the absence of certain kinds of necessary culturally determined predispositions. It is this intrinsic disposition to blame the victims that constructs as given the exclusion of First Nation(s) students.

> Racial knowledge, then gets extended socioscientifically through invoking certain assumptions or employing established methodologies that tend to entail racist or racially determined conclusions or outcomes. This may be exemplified by what I will call the 'informal fallacy of blaming the marginalized'. The fallacy manifests itself in the work of social scientists setting out with the assumption or to prove (often these are hard to distinguish) that the marginalized position of some racial group is tied to a set of damaging (or damaged) cultural values; to a culture of racially specified poverty; to a poverty of the racial culture in question; to cultural deprivation; or to an unrealistic, outmoded, and self-defeating ideology (Goldberg,1993:166).

It is racialized ideological discourse that still lies under much of current Native educational literature that writes to cultural "difference" and ensures "differential exclusion". Cultural "difference" is simply a cover for discussions centred around racial "difference". The discursive construction of First Nation(s) cultural differences, while seemingly focused on social configuration is implicated with biological innuendoes. In essence, the social and the physiological while often conflated, tend in Native educational discourse to be driven by the latter. While the discourse today expresses itself through a medium of culture, the preconceptualizations embedded within the discourse suggest an implicit commitment to the biologically driven notion of race. "Once a group is racialized, and especially where the racial creation of the group runs deep into the history of its formation, the more likely will it be that the group and its members are made to carry its racialized nature with them" (Goldberg,1993:174).

The Ideological Nature of Racialized Discourse

It is only through an analysis of how the ideological strategies of naturalization, universalization and ahistoricity are used in Native educational discourse that it becomes possible to understand the ways in which these ideological strategies are used to weave the central discursive strands for the scaffolding in the racially constructed "differential construction" of First Nation(s) peoples. As it is in the heart of essentialist arguments that these strategies are the most apparent, I have chosen this discursive location to begin my analysis of the ideological strategies used to construct the racial "other". I will argue that the two major "points" on the modernist "line" in Native educational discourse, the microanalytical approach which addresses pedagogical and curriculum concerns and the macroanalytical approach which focuses on the systemic relationships between Euro-Canadian and First Nation(s) groups, are built upon the two central theoretical concepts of neo-Darwinist theory. The first of these concepts is biological determinism. The concept of biological determinism is based on the idea that an organism's make up is based on internal hereditary factors. The second central concept is environmental determinism. Environmental determinism is based on a belief that different organisn's adapt in different ways to their environment.

At this point it may be helpful to introduce the notion of *split reference*. Put forth by Ricoeur (1983), it is a notion which suggests that the terms of a discourse carry out their ideological role by explicitly referring to one thing and implicitly referring to another; entangling the referents in a way which serves to sustain relations of domination. Put another way, meaning is mobilized through the splitting of the referential domain in order to sustain relations of domination. In one sense, the discursive ability to naturalize and universalize First Nation(s) groups is derived through this split referential. Essentialist arguments I have argued, claim that it is cultural "differences" that impede First Nation(s) individuals from "progressing" in the educational system. These include vis-a-vis acculturation theory; identifiable cultural characteristics including world view perspective, socio/cultural organization, cognitive strategies and learning styles.

In Ricoeur's concept of split reference, the first order reference is to culture. The underlying second order reference used to promote this type of explanation however, is based on race. Moreover, this second order reference is driven by conceptual terrain that uses Darwinist premises from which to build its case. Put slightly differently, I am arguing that it is biological assumptions that drive the cultural construction of First Nation(s) groups in most of the Native educational discourse. In cultural deterministic discourse, the idealized "other", bound by essentialist arguments, is discursively constructed first and foremost through racist theory that claims the possibility of identifying unique *biological* characteristics understood to have developed within an *evolutionary* context.

> As a mode of exclusion, racist expression assumes authority and is vested with power, literally and symbolically, in bodily terms. They are human bodies that are classified, order, valorized and

> devalued...Classification of differences determines order. Hierarchy is established on that basis of a value of purity - whether interpreted biologically in terms of blood or genes, hygienically in terms, for instance, of body odor, culturally for example, language as signifying the evolution of thought patterns and rational capacity or even environmentally (Goldberg,1993:54).

Cognition, Ideology and First Nation(s) "Others"

To investigate this second order referential, the sociobiological position embedded in the ideological discursive tools of naturalization and universalization, I offer a discussion of research directed towards the intelligence of First Nation(s) individuals. The argument that cultural determinism is synonymous with biological determinism in Native educational discourse can be demonstrated by an examination of the research directed towards the cognitive differences of First Nation(s) students and the linkage made between these cognitive differences and educational pedagogy.

There is, at least for the discourse of Native education, a rather large body of literature which addresses Native cognitive abilities.[2] Historically, the discursive origins of this field began in the 1800's. Senior (1993:151), in reviewing the literature on this topic, notes that the first intelligence test administered to a Native individual was in the 1800's by Samuel Morton. As with the rest of the scientific community of his day, Morton theorized that the volume of a skull was directly proportional to the intellectual capacity of the brain in it. Senior writes that in Morton's estimation, "Indians were close to the bottom of the human intelligence scale. She goes on to add however, "that there were questions about his [Morton] attempts to use his data to prove *his own prejudices* (1993:151, emphasis added).

---

[2] Since the late 1920's, a portion of the research into Indian education in Canada has included measuring the intelligence of students using standardized tests. Indeed McShane, reviewing the published literature on this subject cites over two hundred references (McShane and Berry,1988).

Given the philosophical and scientific bent of those times, this conclusion is neither particularly revealing nor surprising. However, two hundred years later there is a continued adherence to Samuel Morton's physiological premises. Damian McShane, who has published research on North American Indians "mental abilities" twenty-five times between 1977 and 1988, produces research which embodies the same biological assumptions of Samuel Morton. Among McShane's research for example, are numerous studies based on the examination of Neuropsychological Factors. McShane,1983a, in a replication of Morton's study, measured neuroanatomical asymmetries (differences in the relative sizes of the right/left, front/back sides of the skull) for 192 American Indian, Black, Vietnamese and White subjects on CT scans, finding physiological differences for particular groups. McShane, Risse & Rubens also produced a study which identified differences in the neuroanatomical asymmetries of the brain for different ethnic groups. Finally McShane & Willenberg (1984) *produced a study that offered a correlation between neuroanatomical asymmetries and the reported use of alcohol*[3] (emphasis added).

Central Premises - Neo-Darwinism and the Evolutionist Voice

That this type of research continues to be sanctified and carried out begins to illustrate that there is in Native educational discourse, at least one area which bases its research and theory on the evolutionist premise that human beings can be classified according to the differential development of innate mental capabilities. The transition from quite primitive to higher organization, writes John Smith (1984:120), is central to any satisfactory theory of Evolution. Smith (1984:79) notes that the Evolutionist position "holds that there has been both a transformation of form of organisms and the emergence of novelty in the universe. Central to any Evolutionist position is the idea of transformation of Form, with a trend for both *increasing complexity and increasing differentiation of Form*"(emphasis added).

---

[3] McShane (1988:95) also comments that "one interesting question coming out of these findings, and related to recent developments in the neurosciences, raised the issue of whether or not there were yet other basic differences between Indian and non-Indians. Initial research into the anatomy and functioning of the brain suggested this might be a fruitful area for further exploration".

Biological Determinism

Plotkin and Odling-Smee, (1981) provide a helpful model for outlining the physiological premises upon which the classification and gradiation of intelligence is laid out in McShane's research. While Plotkin and Odling-Smee offer a lengthy detailed analysis of this biological model it can be summarized as follows. In this model there are four basic levels to the evolutionary process. The first level of evolution is genetic. The purpose of the genetic system, whose referent is the gene pool of a breeding population is the change in gene frequencies in that gene pool. One level above is a epigenesis process which interacts with the environment. On this level the organism gains information through interaction with alternative developmental pathways in its environment. The third level of evolution is the process of learning, and the referent for this level is the central nervous system. The third level of evolutionary learning is determined by the first which is the gene pool. All information gained by the learner is confined to the phenotype of the individual organism, although if adaptively successful, it may ultimately affect reproductive success and shape the gene pool. The fourth level of evolution is socioculture. For such a sociocultural occurrence to take place, there must be (1) a group of organisms capable of learning and (2) this group must have available a non-genetic channel of communication for the transmission of learned information. It is necessary for both sender and receiver to gain such information through third level learning processes. The fourth level is also constrained by the first level.

What is important to note here is that in evolutionary theory, the third level, the ability to learn, and the fourth level, socio-cultural development, are bound by their relation to the first evolutionary level, the gene pool. Essentially this is the argument put forward by cognition researchers like McShane. Mental abilities are connected quite directly with the gene pool of the group being researched and linked causally to the group's ability to learn and to its cultural development. Wilgosh & Mulcahy (University of Alberta,1993), provide further examples of the embedded socio-biological premises that drive the work in this area of Native education. Wilgosh and Mulcahy (1993), outlining the difficulty in adapting norm-referenced assessment instruments and curriculum content for Native learners, suggest what they consider to be a radically different approach to assessment, teaching and learning.

And what is this new approach? It is an approach that seeks to reconfigure the cognition of Native children! Wilgosh and Mulcahy suggest no more than rewiring the way Native students think in order to facilitate pertinent student adaptation to mainstream education. This implies of course, that educational difficulties stem from the Native student's metacognitive and cognitive strategies. What is never written in this publication, but constantly implied, is the necessity of reconfiguring the "primitive" thought processes and learning strategies of Native students. As support for this approach, Wilgosh and Mulcahy (1993:132), cite (Hilliard, 1992), who claims "that to be of real value to culturally diverse groups of children any educational intervention must produce significant and meaningful change in the student's cognitive and academic functioning". They claim that the emphasis in educational intervention strategies should be geared towards both social and academic cognitive and metacognitive strategies. The goal for pedagogical strategies they insist, should be to reconfigure the learning process, a reconfiguration which they view as critical for youngsters who have difficulty learning or are poorly motivated. Thus, they write that the focus should be on teaching learning-thinking skills "...which may be particularly useful in *modifying inefficient strategies for Native youngsters*" (Wilgosh & Mulcahy, 1993:133, emphasis added).

In Native educational discourse, this cognitive differential has often been identified as a supposed reliance on "right hemisphere" dominance. Browne (1990:28) for example, identifies learning qualities linked with "right hemisphericity" which "included a preference for a personal and informal relationships with authority figures and group work toward common goals". It is telling that so much of the microanalytical research on "cultural" learning styles comes to the same type of conclusions (see Chapter Four & Five). These types of conclusions reflect the kind of neo-Darwinist logic that psychologists like McShane, Wilgosh and Mulcahy put forth in their papers.

This line of reasoning conflates the genetic make-up of a human organism, in the biological sense, with claims about persons in the socio-cultural sense. The cognition of Native students and their ability to learn is universalized, naturalized, evaluated and tied to the commonality of racial genetic interests. Goldberg (1993:73), quite rightly argues that "this common claim confuses the level of individual biological reproduction with cultural reproduction, and conflates the general conditions for the possibility of culture - of any human activity- with the actual reproduction of specific cultural expressions". Stated slightly differently; there is a failure to distinguish between biological history and the history of social institutions and practices. Culture is not biologically transmitted or fully determined, at least not in any direct way.

Environmental Determinism

The research that directs itself to the racial cognitive contains a necessary complementary strand. Joseph Smith (1984:139) notes that in Neo-Darwinistic theory "there is an intrinsic dualism in the tradition which arises from its two fold conceptualization of organisms as vehicles of internal hereditary factors on the one hand and as organisms that have adapted in particular ways to the external environment". The contextualization within which the embedded explanations for the these innate differences in mental competence occur, is one of an anthropological notion of adaptation. In this concept of adaptation, different cultures are understood to have developed in relation to divergent environments that have demanded distinct adaptation strategies.

In the concept of environmental determinism lies the basis for the macroanalytical theories built as they are on the premise that groups are isolated and stable. Sherry Ortner (1984), in her article, "Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties", writes that in the late 1950's and early 1960's American cultural and psychological anthropologists worked from the premise that cultures evolve into their specific forms through the process of adapting to their surrounding environment. Arguments of this nature in Native educational discourse are put forth by Vernon, Jackson, and Messick, (1988:208) who argue that, "It has long been recognized...that cultural differences between groups may exert a profound influence on the differential development of distinct patterns of mental abilities."

It is upon this neo-Darwinist evolutionist notion of adaptation that cultural determinism's isolationist mandate constructs itself. The environment for First Nation(s) populations as a group is most often identified and written as not only different but naturally and universally isolated from Euro-Canadians. The naturalization and universalization of Native peoples turns not only on their inherent biological makeup as a group, but on a specific environmental context understood to have shaped this biological imperative. Steward,(1953) writes that "specific cultures evolve their specific forms in the process of adapting to specific environmental conditions, and that the *apparent uniformity of evolutionary stages* is actually a matter of similar adaptations to similar natural conditions in different parts of the world" (cited in Ortner, 1984:128, emphasis added).

And what is the ecological context to which this racial group is most suited and subsequently relegated? Isolation is rationalized in cultural deterministic discourse on grounds of evolutionary stages of environmental adaptation. One of the discursive ideological strategies that I discussed in Chapter Five is that of ahistoricity. A prominent characteristic of ideological discourse is its dehistoricizing thrust which freezes both time and space. It is this ideological reliance on environmental determinism that freezes Native history in cultural deterministic theory.

An investigation into the prehistorizing ideological tactic embodied in Native educational discourse leads us back to the conceptual axioms of universalization and naturalization grounded in the neo-Darwinistic principles of biological and environmental adaptation. More often than not, the historical freezing of First Nation(s) is constructed through the term "traditional". The word "traditional" in Native educational discourse carries not only an implied reference to the past, but to the "primitive" (see beginning of chapter). In anthropological evolutionary theory, primitive societies represent a particular stage from which more complex societies developed. In Native educational discourse, it is within the term "primitive" that the development of First Nation(s) populations tend to remain. The "primitive" so the logic goes, have no past because they are the past. Put another way, primitive societies are constructed as an Euro-centric evolutionary past, frozen in inertia, never to appear except as a foil to legitimate Euro-centric superior progress and civilized advancement.

Ahistoricity it can be said, serves as an identity marker and is involved in the construction of borders. The purpose of these borders is to allow the construction of more or less set divisions between groups identified as self and other. Moreover, in Native educational discourse, these borders have been historically erected around and upon the ideological notions of graded racial construction. The construction of these boundaries continues today through binary, ideological terms that cast First Nation(s) societies as a racially differentiated group that is secondary to the civilized order. As "others", they are discursively constructed as nomadic, communal in family and property relations rather than sedentary, nuclear, and committed to private property. They are illogical in mentality and practice magic rather than being rational and scientific in their approach to the world. In popular terms, "nonwhite primitives have come to be conceived as childlike, intuitive, and spontaneous; they require the iron fist of 'European' governance and paternalistic guidance to control inherent physical violence and sexual drives" Goldberg (1993:153).

Never considered in this master narrative, is that this type of argument is only logically possible in pre-contact history. While homogenous First Nation(s) groups may have seemed self-evident at the time of contact there is the small fact of "discovery" and ensuing four hundred years of interaction between the Euro-Canadian world and First Nation(s) societies. Within this socio-cultural positioning of First Nation(s) peoples, lies Euro-centric classificatory value laden logic which writes First Nation(s) populations in the realm of the past and the primitive. This furthers the stabilization of the conceptual premises of isolation and group homogeneity. It is a racist ideological strategy that has been carried through to the present day cultural determinist discourse. First Nation(s) peoples have been split apart from their history, being written within the historical configurations of a precontact past that no longer exists yet is tenaciously held on to by those who write cultural "difference" theory in Native education.

The discourse of biological determinism embedded in Native cognition research, inscribed as it were as a measurement of racial possibility, refuses to acknowledge the manner in which First Nation(s) groups have been constructed in the interest of legitimating and validating Euro-Canadian society. Instead, discrete and identifiable cognitive abilities are blindly related to differential adaptation theory that supports the dominant position of Euro-Canadians. First Nation(s) peoples struggle in the Euro-Canadian education system because of different mental faculties. This differentiation is based on an understanding that Native peoples mental physiology evolved in response to a "traditional" environment. The implication is that First Nation(s) peoples have adapted in specific ways to accommodate a specific type of environment. In Native educational literature, evidence for this argument is found in both the identified different learning styles and the narrowly constructed view of what constitutes cultural knowledge. This racist logic allows for the discursive construction of First Nation(s) individuals as victims of their own biological accord and is the ultimate indicator of Foucault's concept of "differential exclusion". As Smith (1984:179) argues, in neo-Darwinist theory,

> the principle generative mechanism is a predetermined programme analogous to a computer programme 'outlining a number of operations and a 'preformed' set of data on which the operations are to be performed, concludes that for some behavioural modes of social organization individuals could not do otherwise, and that the mode of organization cannot be other than it is.

The central premises in cultural determinism are predicated, shaped, and written on racist terrain which can be summarized as follows. First Nation(s) people as an singular, isolated and homogenous population share a common hereditary gene pool. It is their internal genetic makeup, including their mental abilities, that has determined the socio-cultural shape of First Nation(s) societies. This "naturalization" of the "different" cognitive abilities of First Nation(s) peoples is directly linked to a distinct and isolated environment. Consequently, the conclusions drawn from this line of reasoning can never be anything but the ones already drawn in Native educational discourse; First Nation(s) individuals do not have the necessary fundamental capacities to function in Euro-Canadian society. Sternberg (1988:148) marks the hegemonic nature of this linkage between cognitive ability and the adjustment of a group to its environment when he writes that, "Intelligence is essentially a cultural invention to account for the fact that some people are able to succeed in their environment better than others."

Implicit in this racist "theme", is that while First Nation(s) cannot help who they are, nor can Euro-Canadian society. This not only relieves Euro-Canadian society of any responsibility or accountability but it also masks and justifies the power relationships embedded in and around the racial ideological construction of this type of knowledge.

> The scientific cloak of racial knowledge, its formal character and seeming universality, imparts authority and legitimation to it. Its authority is identical with, it parasitically maps onto the formal authority of the scientific discipline it mirrors. At the same time, racial knowledge is able to do this because it has been historically integral to the emergence of these authoritative scientific fields. Race has been a basic categorical object, in some cases a founding focus of scientific analysis in these various domains (Goldberg, 1993:149).

Racist Ideology

Cultural determinism is racist theory presented in a cultural idiom and legitimated by ideological notions deeply embedded in Euro-centric history[4]. It is a theory ideologically racist in so far as it is biased towards providing justifications for discriminations which "differentially excludes" various "others" from positions of status and power. What is the point for example, of constructing theory that concerns itself with measuring intelligence except to demonstrate that there are degrees of intelligence that can be used to explain why "different" races succeed or fail in school. Smith (1984:287) argues,

---

[4] Some notable examples of ideologically driven racist discourses are social Darwinism, eugenics, sociobiology and intelligence quotient theory (John Smith,1984:103).

> We know from the extensively documented history of such research that it has produced only misery and further crippling inequalities and exploitation, not the liberation of human beings per se. However, in a sexist, racist society what this type of research does, is readily supply intellectual weapons for racists.

Given its a priori biases, the ramifications of such gradient based work in Native educational discourse is that it continues through the "preconceptualization" of innate "differential exclusion" to draw the necessary line between entitlement and restriction.

I have argued that Native educational discourse, built on the concept of cultural determinism rests on deeply embedded ideological strategies that mould the personal and social identity of First Nation(s) collectives in racist terms that exclude, marginalize and fix their place in history. Moreover, these imposed constructions, evoked through discursive "central premises" and "preconceptuals" freeze not only the "other" but the "not other" into marked identities, perspectives and dispositions.

> Production of social knowledge about the racialized Other, establishes a library or archive of information, a set of guiding ideas and principles about the Otherness: a mind, characteristic behavior or habits, and predictions of likely responses. The Other, as object of study, may be employed but only as informant, as representative translator of culture. The set of representations thus constructed and catalogued in turn condemns those so defined within the constraints of the representational limits, restricting the possibilities available to those rendered racially other as it delimits their nature. The spaces of the Other - the colonies, plantations, reservations,.... become the laboratory in which these epistemological constructs may be tested (Goldberg,1993:150) .

The discursive power to shape and construct First Nation(s) identities is directly related to complex questions of power, authority and knowledge. It revolves around questions about who has the power to define "otherness" and for what purposes. The production of this ideologically constituted social knowledge in Native educational discourse, contextualized by racially determinist terrain, has for all intents and purposes constructed all First Nation(s) students in terms of a singular objectified, idealized "other" whose basic "nature" is biologically determined through adaptatation to a "primitive past" and whose learning abilities and education must be accommodated as such.

Chapter Seven

Countertheme

If counterpoint to the theme is used consistently, it can be designated as countertheme (Owen, 1992: 203).

Counterpoint Discourses and Native Education

In this chapter I direct my attention to educational counterpoint theory and pedagogy that I think may offer the means to undermine and displace the "racist theme" inherent to so much of Native educational discourse. It is a gesture that aims to decenter the authority of the cultural determinist "regime of truth" through a proliferation of alternative positions . The central argument in this dissertation has been that the construction of First Nation(s) "others" in the governing Native educational discourse, a discourse defined and controlled primarily by those belonging to Euro-Canadian society, centres itself on racially constituted ideological terrain. This racist ideology is coupled with "equality of opportunity" liberal ideology to frame the debate in terms of cultural conflict rather than in terms of power, knowledge, authority and the construction of social reality.

To address issues such as these, it becomes necessary to reflect critically on history, race, culture, knowledge, authority, power and education. I suggest this can be initiated through an incorporation of three broad areas. The first area that needs to be incorporated is that of cultural theory. It is only by incorporating more substantive conceptualizations of culture that the displacement of the authorized grand narrative in Native educational discourse will be brought about. The second is the incorporation of critical pedagogical theory, taken up as a strategy to further rupture and dismantle racist and meritocratic liberal ideologies found in much of this discourse. The third area which needs to be included is the "other" voices which already exist in Native educational discourse.

Alternative Cultural Theory

To begin theorizing "culture" as more than a description of categories constructed through value laden classification, it is necessary to explore alternative theoretical concepts of culture. Culture is not some static "thing" intimately tied to determinate, invariable catch-all descriptors of collective racialized social agency. Unfortunately, the modernist "line" in Native educational discourse provides us with just such a notion. It offers a concept of "culture" that presents its object as immobile and fossilized: "It presents First Nations cultures as art, totem poles, teepees, moccasins and feather headdresses... Viewed in this way, culture becomes a collection of objects and visible rituals, understood apart from their real meaning within the particular cultural context" (McCaskill,1987:155). In Native educational discourse, Native culture is often represented as no more and no less than the sum of its describable parts and symbolic components. It is a representation that characterizes Native culture as a "thing" which reproduces itself within a narrow framework of oppressive stereotypes. To write culture as such is to reify and reduce culture to an inert category by which to differentiate groups of people "either in terms of some primordial sociobiological criteria"(Van den Berghe:1981) or because groups of people share certain cultural values that are realized in overt unity in various cultural forms.

Culture, despite the manner in which it has often been decontextualized in Native educational discourse, is located in the real living experiences of people and is a product of the social, political and ideological relations in which it is inscribed. A "counter point" concept of culture needs to be based first and foremost on theoretical terrain which contextualizes culture as an ongoing process that produces change despite systemic limitations: "Culture must be viewed as the particular ways in which a social group lives out and makes sense of its 'given' circumstances and conditions of life" (McLaren,1989:91).

A critical concept of cultural production also needs to acknowledge that agency is necessarily involved in the creation, reappropriation and struggle for meaning in order to make sense of and reconfigure the world one inhabits. While taking into account the constraints that First Nation(s) groups and individuals live within, it does not typecast Native people as silently and passively living out predetermined lives as victims. Instead, a critical notion of cultural production struggles to uncover how Native people subjectively live both their power and powerlessness.

Finally, a critical conceptualization of culture needs to take into account the ongoing various processes that erupt, intersect and change culture's terrain, mapping "cultural production" as a notion that carries within it, contested areas and sociohistorical relations of power. Roman(1993:174) articulates this approach towards a more critical inception of cultural theory when she writes,

> Cultural theory is at its most significant when it is concerned with the relations between the many and diverse human activities which have been historically and theoretically grouped in these ways, and especially when it explores these relations as at once dynamic and specific within describably whole historical situations which are also, as a practice, changing and in the present changeable.

If a critical concept of cultural production is to be of any use in Native educational discourse, it has to be one that not only knocks the ideologically racist construction of culture from its central position in this discourse, but acknowledges and strives to understand First Nation culture(s) as constituted by dynamic, multidimensional, multivocal voices and heterogenous processes. The concept of culture cannot be theorized as fluid and contradictory, cutting across lines of gender, age, geography, various First Nation(s) societies, individual identities and representational positions. The task of constructing a viable "counter point" concept of culture in Native educational discourse is to develop "cultural" theory that argues on behalf of First Nation(s) subjects both in terms of cultural production and sociohistorical relations while simultaneously undercutting the racist driven, value sloped essentialism which serves as the underlying racist "theme" in cultural determinist discourse.

Critical Pedagogy

Another route for "interrupting" the racist "regime of truth" in Native educational discourse, is one located in a sounder theory of education and of the political practice within it. It is a "counter point" to modernist pedagogy that attempts to understand the social constructedness of educational discourse itself and to unveil and disrupt the various forces which work to shape and mould it.

> What are the strategies of escape from knowledge? These necessary questions suppose that knowledge and ignorance are imbricated with relations of power and thus disrupt any pretense of textual innocence (Britzman, Santiago-Valles, Munoz, Lamash, 1993:198).

One way of disrupting this "textual innocence", is through further interrogation and dismantlement of the ideological strategies located in Native educational discourse. Interrupting the discourse in this way seeks to prevent further construction of "a knowledge which is ideological in the sense that it preserves conception and means of description which represent the world as it is for those who rule it, rather than as it is for those who are ruled" (Smith, 1985:267). Native educational discourse tends to view schools within the liberal model of reform based on specific notions of personhood. This has had the effect of stabilizing, rather than challenging, the racist and meritocratic ideologies embedded in the discourse.

Seeking out and challenging the racist ideological scaffolding that underwrites the modernist "line" in Native educational discourse, would help unravel the discursive means by which First Nation(s) cultures and identities have been constituted. It would not only address knowledge as socially produced but as deeply implicated in the unequal social relations outside the school door. As Goldberg (1993:151) argues,

> Those thus rendered Other are sacrificed to the idealization, excluded from the being of personhood, from social benefits and from political self-representation. Erased in the name of a universality that has no place for them the subjects of real political economy are denied and silenced, ontologically and epistemologically, and morally evicted. The universal claims of Western knowledge, colonial or postcolonial, turn necessarily upon the deafening suppression of its various racialized Others into silence.

Dispositional Knowledge

Discursive power and authority to define the "other" through the production of knowledge about First Nation(s) has most often been constructed within the canon - the foundational word - the truth. Moreover, it is such limited knowledge and restated so often that it is perpetually reinforces and perpetuates the racist "regime of truth" in which it has been inscribed. In this "regime of truth", Native educational discourse has generally garnered information about First Nation(s) cultures in two ways. It has detailed the racial nature of First Nation(s) as a monolithic entity and has furnished the essential necessities for the "others" modification and modernization, providing the formula to launch the "other" from its frozen prehistorical dimensions in time and space into present civilized time. It is a construction of culture based on the theme of racialized ideological essentialism, a "theme" that organizes the relations of First Nation(s) and Euro-Canadian societies around, "...racial relations of domination and subordination in cultural forms and ideological practices of identity formation and representation in schooling" (McCarthy & Crichlow,1993: xix).

Most Native educational discourse provides knowledge about the "other" in order to better to deal with them. Tierney (1992:139) claims that, "Knowledge may be thought of in three ways: knowledge that, how, and to". '*Knowledge that*' pertains to factual information [or put slightly differently - descriptive knowledge]. '*Knowledge how*' is directed towards skill development or as Goldberg (1993:164) explains,"...directed toward how to civilize, how to approach and relate to the 'other'". Identity and representation in the production of social knowledge about the "other" in Native educational discourse is generally built around knowledge "that" and knowledge "how". That the discourse has followed this modernist "line" of knowledge construction towards the "other", should come as no surprise since the discourse has been marked by underlying questions which have usually sought answers to questions about "how" to assimilate or integrate "that" through education.

Recall that the initial focus in Native educational discourse was to garner knowledge about "that" [First Nation(s) groups] in order to develop knowledge "how"[educational theory and practice] to shape and mould the First Nation(s) "others" into Euro-Canadians. The assimilationist theory of "cultural deprivation" discussed in Chapter Four for example, claimed knowledge "that" [First Nation(s)] children lacked the necessary cultural attributes required for school learning. Picking up the first central "point" in acculturation theory, that First Nation(s) individuals could be categorized by specific identifiable characteristics, assimilationist theory produced educational knowledge about "how" to proceed in schools to ensure that First Nation(s) "others" gave up their "un Euro-centric" values and became as Euro-Canadian as the construction warranted.

When the knowledge about "how" to educate "that" [First Nation(s)] failed to meet its assimilationist objectives, the prevailing assimilative model gave way to one of integration. In the integrationist model, educational knowledge about "how" to teach "that"[First Nation(s) students] positioned itself along lines of cultural and racial group autonomy. Taking up the second central "point" of acculturation theory, cultural knowledge about "that" [First Nation(s) groups] insisted this was a group that was both isolated and stable. In the integrationist model, the educational script centred around "how" to integrate "that" [First Nation(s) culture] within the school. An example of this type of knowledge construction, is reflected in "cultural disadvantage" theory also discussed in Chapter Four. Cultural disadvantage theory claimed "that" [First Nation(s) groups] while not culturally deprived, were disadvantaged since they were only competent in their own culture. This integrationist focus produced educational knowledge on "how" to overcome this disadvantage through bi-cultural education.

However despite the shift, both integration and assimilation educational models revolved around mainstream core values located in the assimilative stance. Whether First Nation(s) values were to be erased or collectively integrated, they were still separated out and marked by their "difference" to Euro-Canadian values. The modernist "line" of culture and education was and continues to be constructed on "dominant" values. It is these core values that furnish the grounds for the production of knowledge "how" to develop culturally appropriate educational curriculum and pedagogy: "The dualism of this model is reflected in its pluralist allowances at the margins with its univocal core insistences at the center. The central values continued to be defined hegemonically by those who were politically and economically dominant" (Golberg,1993:219).

There is a third approach to knowledge production, one Tierney (1992:140) identifies as knowledge "to" or what critical theorists call dispositional knowledge. It is a theoretical "counter point" in education which analyzes the construction of knowledge in ways that assess critically the values canonical knowledge has been built around.

> Rather than view culture apolitically, as functional aspects of society or as sets of values and beliefs, the goal is to see culture in terms of cultural politics; first, in terms of values, preferences and beliefs; then in terms of the individual's interactions with dominant truths and power formations that marginalize and silence subordinate groups in society (McLaughlin,1993:97).

In discussions of dispositional knowledge, static fact or "canons" of knowledge are rejected and instead discussions pertain to how knowledge gets constructed and defined. Dispositional knowledge for example, might be "to" understand one's racial heritage in terms of the structural and ideological relationships with the larger society. This might mean for example, having Native students analyze the values and beliefs used to construct the educational "that" and "how" knowledge which now serves to construct them in Native educational discourse:"Although students may be taught the facts of their native pasts, the emphasis is never on the structural and ideological relationships of those facts to the larger society" (Tierney, 1992:141). In this way students can begin to understand how as subjects they are organized to know and learn to critique the values and assumption which bind them to certain discursive constructions.

It is a critical approach that understands knowledge as a political act, circumscribed by history, social structure and the individual interpretations of both the observed and the observer. It is this knowledge "to", this dispositional knowledge, which could be a very useful tool for demystifying Native educational discourse.

> Demystification is the most illuminating mode of theoretical inquiry for those who promote the new cultural politics of difference. Demystification tries to keep track of the complex

> dynamics of institutional and other related power structures in order to disclose options and alternatives for transformational praxis; it also attempts to grasp the way in which representational strategies are creative responses to move circumstances and conditions (West,1993:19).

To demystify the production of knowledge through critical discursive gestures of knowledge "to", offers the theoretical means to interrogate critically the current demarcations that exist in the constant discursive production and reproduction of attributions, differences, desires and capacities that write First Nation(s) peoples as separate and dispossessed from Euro-Canadian society in Native education.

Seeking out dispositional knowledge is an approach that understands the need to do more than simply change the canon as liberal educational approaches attempt to do. "The failure of this approach is that it is based on a notion of shared moral values that does not bring into question how those values are defined; in essence, students are never taught to become critically engaged with dispositional knowledge"(Tierney, 1992:141). Instead there is an insistence to critically interrogate what a canon means, defining the values that underlie the canon and the implications this has for the "other" in the social construction of knowledge.

> As opposed to an emphasis on factual knowledge, a critical analysis offers preeminence to educational communities devoted to advancing discussion of dispositional knowledge. Static facts or 'canons' of knowledge are rejected and instead discussions pertain to how knowledge gets constructed and defined" (Tiernay,1991:143).

Knowledge is approached as something that expresses and embodies specific interests and values that privilege some and silence others. The investigation of "knowledge" thus becomes the engagement of individuals in critically analyzing the power relationships invested in the authoritative voice that defines the social organization of knowledge and the values that serve as the foundation for this knowledge.

This concept of "dispositional" knowledge has significant implications for Native educational discourse. Critical pedagogy that takes disposition knowledge as it main focus, encourages students to lay claim to their own voices and histories and to critically interrogate, reconstruct and appropriate knowledge as their own. As such, it allows First Nation(s) peoples to begin defining and naming the limits and boundaries of their own authority. In doing so it acknowledges that First Nation(s) identities are neither fixed or monolithic but multivocal and multidimensional. From a critical pedagogical stand point, First Nation(s) subjectivities are marked by discourse that produces, represents and reinvents their identity "created by a multiplicity of interests, positions and desires that are in varying degrees, subject to change" (Perez,1993:272).

Brookes (1992:150), discusses how engagement with dispositional knowledge might be implemented in the classrooms through pedagogy that seeks to unveil the constructedness of knowledge. She writes,

> In schooling environments designed to reproduce the status quo, it is an illusion that students will be taught 'naturally' to critique the constructedness of knowledge and the practices and ideologies producing and reproducing relations of power.

This I read to mean that it is important to teach First Nation(s) students in ways that do more than focus on bi-cultural competence through the addition of cultural content, be that traditional beading, tanning or even First Nation(s) histories and cultural achievements. Rather Brookes argues for a pedagogical approach which seeks to criticize meanings, to make knowledge problematic and to direct attention to the ideological forces that influence First Nation(s) lives. It is a position that seeks to authorize those so constructed, the space from which to begin making sense of the way their lives have been socially constructed.

> This involves nothing short of assuming power: the power of the racialized, of the racially excluded and marginalized, to articulate for themselves and to represent for others who they are and what they want, where they come from, how the see themselves incorporated into the body politic, and how they see the social body reflecting them (Goldberg,1993:237).

The Euro-Centric "Other"

Having claimed that knowledge "to" might provide a discursive "counter point" towards subverting the racist "theme" in Native educational discourse, at the same time it is *critical* to emphasize that this pedagogical approach on the counterpoint "line" holds within it the very dangers critiqued in modernist accounts of knowledge production. It does so for there is a real possibility that a pedagogical approach that seeks to help Native students "to" critically understand their position in terms of the meanings and values embedded in the production of knowledge about "them", will be written on the same modernist terrain that objectifies Native peoples. There is a strong possibility that First Nation(s) "others" will still be read as the "object" to be addressed, implying as does modernist discourse, that it is the sole responsibility of First Nation(s) to dismantle and undermine the hegemonic constructedness of their lives. This of course would simply keep the discourse in the "regime of truth" that circulates on modernist terrain, hegemonically exclusionary and marginalizing in its implications and implementation.

> No pedagogy which is truly liberating can remain distant from the oppressed by treating them as unfortunates and by presenting for their emulation models from among the oppressors. The oppressed must be their own example in the struggle for their redemption (Friere,1970:39).

I now turn my attention towards the inherent danger which lies within critical pedagogy; unreflective appeals to a conception of authority that reinforces the educational structures and power relations that exist. In this conception of authority lies the very real problem that those who are in power, be they those who write Native educational discourse or those who practice in classrooms, are also the individuals who are capable of defining knowledge, a knowledge that continues to define those who are not in power.

A critical pedagogical approach, as thoughtful and as "liberating" as it might be in its insistence towards critically analyzing the production of knowledge, is a position that often fails realize that it is not the exclusive obligation of the "other" to take on the task of emancipation. Although addressing feminist postmodern discourse, Roman reflects this general weakness of critical pedagogy. It is a weakness that has significant implications for Native education. She asks,

> Why, after all, does so much of the current literature written from a postmodernist and feminist postmodernist perspective on the politics of difference, identity, and voice nonetheless fail to locate whiteness and Westerness within the studies of women's experiences of differential power and lived culture (Roman,1993:77)?

If critical pedagogies are to be taken up by Native educational discourse, *there needs to be an understanding* that those who write or teach, those who at the moment have the power to define the "other", actively take up a dispositional posture in terms of exploring their own power, authority and sociohistorical location in the production of this discourse.

> We can no longer afford to equate 'race' with the anthropological and sociological approach of what Harding calls 'studying down' in the power structure...Instead of focusing our attentions almost exclusively upon racially oppressed groups of women and men as either heroic icons or victims of racist practices and structures, we need to study the enactment of power and ideologies in a relational way.... Provisionally speaking, this would entail studying up in the power structure as well as studying down (Roman, 1993:78).

Individuals who find themselves in privileged positions, whether this is authoritative discursive location or authoritative classroom position, must begin to critique what are generally Euro-centric locations of power and entitlement. As Roman (1993:84) points out, "If white students and educators are to become empowered critical analysts of their own claims to know the privileged world in which their racial interests function, then such privileges and the injustices they reap for others would necessarily become the objects of analyses..." This means that the Euro-centric "other" must among other things, begin to take ethical responsibility for a critical interrogation of the ideologies in which they are implicated and enmeshed. The frameworks now adhered to need to examine and account for the historically specific ways in which "whiteness" is a politically constructed category parasitic on "redness", and "...thereby to conceive of how we have thoroughly mapped, constructed and enmeshed ourselves on the backs of the 'other'" (West,1993:19).

This studying up will involve working towards the dismantlement of discursive mechanisms by which the Euro-centric "other" has come to identify themselves and those deemed racially other. As Hall, (1980:6) asserts, "if racism is to be tackled effectively the conditional status of these categories must be challenged by alternative frameworks..." While Hall is addressing the racial categorization of the "other", I suggest that this statement might just as appropriately be directed towards Euro-centric subjectivity in the socio-historical construction of itself as a racial collective. In a discussion of Rosaldo's (1989) concept of "cultural stripping", Sleeter (1993) puts forth this position when she critiques "whites" naturalization of their identities:

> Whites so internalize their own power and taken-for-granted superiority that they resist self-questioning. Whites appropriate the idea of culture to mean 'sub-categories of whiteness' which can be fleshed out in personal subjective meanings or residual expressions of life in other countries and other times (167).

"Counter point" Voices in Native Educational Discourse

Highlighting those who write "counter point" discourse is of foremost importance in the task of displacing the predominant discourse in Native education. This is not to make the claim that "counter point" discursive voices and knowledges are non-existent in Native educational discourse. Ignoring and resisting Euro-centric representation of First Nation(s) identities has been recorded for as long as the real lived relations between the two have existed. However, it is only recently that these discursive "counter points" have begun to establish themselves with any tenacity in Native educational discourse. Identifying and highlighting these alternative perspectives is (an)"other" way of dismantling the racist "theme" underlying cultural determinist discourse: "The reappearance of these 'subjugated' knowledges should indicate the incompleteness and ideological character of 'official' claims to truth" (Murphy,1993:34).

I highlight the following "counter point" discourse because it either embodies more substantive concepts of cultural production or critically analyzes current cultural/educational knowledge. The first "voice" which I offer as integral to the "counterpoint line" in Native education, is a "voice" that has provided me with a map for this research. Carl Urion is a voice that needs to be attended to in this discourse for a number of reasons. While most of these reasons have already been mentioned in this study, I call upon his voice one more time to illustrate what I consider to be some of the discourse that serves the "counterpoint" line in Native education.

In Native educational discourse, the majority of the research laments the state of Native education and presents a pessimistic reading of the educational situation. Urion, on the other hand, in his editorial "Big Pictures and Paradoxes"(1992), offers an interpretation imbued with hope, acknowledgment and validation of the gains that have been made by First Nation(s) peoples within the educational sphere. For example he writes: "A corollary in K-12 was that by 1990, the national Indian high school drop out rate had dropped to 75% from almost 97% in the early 70's. He goes on to add that "almost half the children living on reserves completed high school without a break"(1992:3). While he does not deny the educational adversity Native peoples have had to contend with, neither does he cast them as victims. Instead, Urion draws our attention to the tremendous gains made by First Nation(s) peoples in the educational arena. By doing so, Urion legitimizes and celebrates First Nation(s) ability to direct their lives. This is suggestive of Willis's (1981) call to focus on cultural production as a place where discourses intersect with creative interpretations and specific site penetrations as a means of reconfiguring the relations that exist between minority groups and the larger society.

Celia Haig-Brown (1995) is another "voice" on the "counterpoint line" worth paying attention to; one that takes up Foucauldian notions of power/knowledge to address the dispositional knowledge underlying Native educational discourse. Taking up a critical conception of cultural production, she offers a perspective that sees power relations as integral to understanding the dynamics of First Nation(s) education.

> Examining power relations offers significant possibilities for rigorous, historically-based and specific research...In addition, unique histories, persisting traditions and current environments (both social and physical) contribute to endless cultural production - a production which develop in relations to all that surrounds it and which is not limited to being a mere reaction to repressive forces (17/18).

Te Hennepe (1993) is another example of some of the "counterpoint" discourse coming out of Native education discourse that has begun to seriously address dispositional knowledge and its relation to power and authority. Her article, "Issues of Respect: Reflections of First Nation(s) student's experiences in postsecondary Anthropology classrooms" gives voice to First Nation(s) student's experiences in an anthropology class. It is a detailed discussion which juxtaposes the authoritative voice - the professor as cultural expert with the authority of First Nation(s) student's voices. Through this juxtaposition, she makes visible the authorized, stereotyped and racist presentation of First Nation(s) "cultural" knowledge being taught in a University classroom. Te Hennepe (1993) argues that Native students should have the authority to speak for themselves about their culture and the issues they are faced with.

> The issue is identified as one of unreconciled claims to authority to describe and define First Nations issues. The oppositional position adopted in this article is one that insists that students speak with authority about their reactions and speak with authority as well about First nations issues (193).

Finally, Brenda LaFrance (1994), "Empowering Ourselves, Making Education and Schooling One" is another "counter point" voice; one which offers a different approach to curriculum development in Native education. In this article she discusses "culturally" appropriate instruction and outlines a "cultural negotiation" approach to schooling that blends Mohawk and Western education.

> Based on the concept of 'cultural negotiation', curriculum for instance is built around the study of water which is looked at from an Indigeneous ecological perspective, while incorporating the study of the chemical composition and properties (25).

LeFrance illustrates the possibility of placing Western education within a Mohawk educational context rather than continually trying to insert "culture" into a Western educational context. She argues quite convincingly that blending the two education systems is both viable and necessary to the formal education and well-being of First Nation(s) students. In doing so, Le France counters the modernist concept of cultural conflict with a concept of cultural production that is sophisticated, dynamic and well adapted to modern times.

Countertheme

I have argued that a substantial amount of Native educational discourse is premised on racist and "equality of opportunity" ideologies which silence, negate and justify the exclusion of First Nation(s) peoples in education. It is a discourse formed in part by Euro-centric ideologies that have typecast First Nation(s) groups and peoples through racist theory which maintains that cultural "difference" is driven by biological and environmental determinism. As such, Native educational discourse has produced social knowledge about First Nation(s) people through ideological strategies which have "naturalized" and "universalized" cultural differences to some prehistoric past. Most Native educational discourse has neglected to consider how the "naturalization" and "universalization" of First Nation(s) individuals has come to be, or the political implications inherent in the power to objectify the "other" upon such ideological terrain.

I have also suggested some theoretical discursive methodological "counter points" for dismantling the racist ideological terrain based on Derridean and Foucauldian textual analyses. Deployed in conjunction with one another, these theoretical discursive devices can be used to undermine ideological essentialisms; doing so in ways that argue on behalf of the First Nation(s) subject both in terms of cultural production and sociohistorical relations.

Extending these deconstruction and incorporative gestures to the classroom, I have claimed that critical pedagogies also have the potential to disrupt and weaken the coupling of racist and meritocratic ideologies inherent to Native educational discourse. I view the critical analysis of Native educational knowledge as a "counter point" pedagogical approach that would allow students and teachers to question the assumptions, meanings and values that lie under modernist accounts of Native educational discourse. As such, critical pedagogies would allow First Nation(s) students, teachers and scholars to analyze how their abilities to access power differ and begin to see how these relations of power have been socially constructed. I also asserted that it was the ethical responsibility of the Euro-centric "other" to analyze their own voice, location and power in this discourse since the knower is so inscribed upon the "others" social being, identity and material location.

I have also offered what I consider to be some discursive examples of the "counterpoint line" found in Native education and see these types of approaches to research and representation as paramount to the reconstruction of Native educational discourse. The silences and elisions that this discourse revolve around need to be interrupted and broken. This "demystification" I contend can best be accomplished by working towards a ***countertheme*** that dismantles both the degrading and exclusionary racist "theme" of cultural determinist theory and the equality of opportunity "theme" coupled in so much of Native educational discourse.

Epilogue

Imagine if you will, what it means to be constructed as alien... It shouldn't be too hard. Our society is consumed by the idea of alien worlds and the threat they pose; Star Trek, Star Wars, War of the Worlds, Independence Day, First Contact, X-Files etc. etc. Our terror of being taken over by aliens is matched only by our terror in becoming like them. Fortunately, in the movies mankind usually prevails - despite the advanced technology of the aliens. It is an overwhelming concern in Western society and one we have carried in our "collective unconscious" for a very long time.

But what if the scenario, just for once, was changed. What if despite our governments and armies, despite our resilience and resistance, the Aliens won and took over our world. What if they weren't interested in our political, economic, or social forms, seeing them as primitive and inconsequential, and instead created a whole new global society based on their needs, interests and wants. What if there was no more Canada, United States, Europe, India or China; if the countries that we know today were simply dismantled and reorganized under an Alien system. What if we were no longer regarded as Canadian or Jamaican or Tibetan or French or Spanish but were socially constructed as one group and lumped together under the label humankind.

What if the Aliens created separate rules and regulations for us to live under. What if we were forbidden to be teachers or businessmen or lawyers or plumbers or doctors. What if our religious beliefs were considered pagan and sacrilegious. What if our churches were burned down and we were forbidden by law to worship, or baptize our children, or go to Mass. What if our children were taken away from us and were put in schools where they were beaten for speaking English and expected to learn Alienese and be educated in the Alien ways. What if we were not allowed to leave our houses without permission from the Alien agent down at the district office, or to secure a living except within certain geographical perimeters. What if we were not allowed to form political groups or belong to Alien justice and law making societies. What if we were expected to earn our living by harvesting sand and were put on land that contained only hard granite rock. What if the explanation for all of this lay in the Alien's assertion that as a species, humankind was backward and primitive, and that these restrictions were the only way to help us advance into the modern world that they were creating. This explanation would provide the Alien nation with the necessary justification to orchestrate the alienation of our world and its people from active and equal participation in their world .

I would imagine that we would all have different strategies for trying to adjust and cope, or not, with what was happening to our lives and our world. Some of us would fight with everything we had, even our lives. Some of us would align ourselves with the Aliens in order to keep the peace and ensure our futures. Some of us would build secret churches and keep worshipping, even if we knew that if we were caught we would be incarcerated and our churches would be burned. Some of us would hide our children when the Aliens came to take them away. Some of us would encourage our children to go to the Alien schools and learn as much as they could about the Alien's ways so that they might have a chance in the future that lay ahead of them. Some of us would try to learn as much as we could about the Alien legal and political systems to try and gain recourse through these systems. Some of us would form our own political groups even though it was forbidden. Some of us would do our best to make sand out of granite and some of us would try to find other ways of feeding our children.

While we would have different ways of trying to accommodate this situation we would all have two things in common. The first is that we would all find ourselves governed by certain restrictions. The second would be that our ability to navigate and negotiate these restrictions would be hindered by the Alien's perception of our ability to do so based on their social construction of our cultural, social and political practices.

Perhaps this is why Western society is obsessed with aliens. Perhaps it is a deep seated fear of being treated the way it has treated those it has come in contact with since the beginning of European imperialism, that drives this obsession. Perhaps it is time to come to terms with this obsession and the dreadful social injustices the Western world has committed in its name.

At the beginning of this dissertation, I mentioned some reasons for taking on this study. To reiterate, I was concerned about the social identity ascribed to my own children and to First Nation(s) students in the classroom and in the prevailing Native educational discourse. I was also concerned about the manner in which this social construction was used to explain the absence of "equality of opportunity" in schools and Canadian society for First Nation(s) peoples. However, in the overall picture, this dissertation has touched on one minuscule aspect of the educational injustices blatantly apparent in Native educational discourse. It has opened the door and looked back to locate the genesis of ideologies used in the discursive construction of a singular First Nation(s) social identity and considered the implications of coupling this social identity with liberal educational ideology. Coming to the end of this study means that I am supposed to have some ideas about where we should go from here in terms of what lines of research might be fruitful and what practical application this research could have for the classroom. Here are a few suggestions.

If Native educational discourse is to be of any benefit to those whose schooling it purports to be interested in, it needs to first work out practices that inhibit imposing representation upon others while encouraging self-representation. As a discourse, it needs to actively resist and displace the various instruments of definition and power it now embodies that converts *difference into otherness*. This will involve taking apart the mechanisms by which social subjects come to identify themselves racially and discriminate against those deemed racially other. One of the ways this might be done is to further examine the assumptions and biases which organize the Native educational research and teaching practices Continually doing so would provide those who work in this field a better viewpoint from which to then examine their own assumptions and biases and those of others.

In the classroom, students might be taught by using their own experiences to understand how knowledge is socially organized. From my perspective, this means those of us who teach must refuse to see First Nation(s) peoples as either silent or as victims, while understanding the restrictions of their victimization. Pedagogical practice needs to work towards a continual taking up of power relations through writing, reading and discussion. It also means that instructors who want to take up this kind of work must be prepared to work with contradictions and crises in a safe and caring environment.

Ultimately, the research and teaching practices we embark on will depend on what sorts of ends we would achieve by our social practices, in what sort of values we find ourselves committed to in undertaking the practices themselves and in our vision of the future.

References

Allison, Derek. J. (1983). Fourth world education in Canada and the faltering promise of Native teacher education programs. *Journal of Canadian Studies, (18)3*, 102-117.

Altbach, P.G., Kelly, G.P. (Eds.) (1978). *Education and colonialism.* New York: Longman.

Appiah, K. A. (1991). Race. In F. Lentricchia and T. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Critical Terms for Literary Study.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Armstrong, Jeannette C. (1987). Traditional indigenous education: a natural process. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (14)3*, 14-19.

Assheton-Smith, M.I. (1977). Acculturation studies of the North American Indian. *Indian Ed/Canadian Journal of Native Education, Winter, 4(2)*, 5-6.

Barman, J., Hebert, Y., McCaskill D., (Eds.) (1987). *Indian education in Canada, volume 1: the legacy.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Barnett, Don. C., Dyer, Aldrich, J. (1983). Research on Native peoples at the University of Saskatchewan. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (10)4*, 12-22.

Benet, Stephen V., Benet, Rosemary. (1981). A book of Americans. In *McDonald's Reproducible/Workbook.* St. Louis, Missouri: McDonald Publishing Company Inc.

Bennett, N. et al. (1976). *Teaching styles and pupil progress.* Harvard University Press.

Bernstein, Richard J. (1976). *The restructuring of social and political theory.* University of Pennsylvania.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1990). *In other words: essays towards reflexive sociology.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre, Wacquant, Loic. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Brandt, Godfrey L. (1986). *The realization of anti-racist teaching.* Philadelphia: The Falmer Press, Taylor and Francis Inc.

Brascoupe, Simon.(1994). Native American education in a contemporary context. *Akwe:won Journal*, 1994, *Spring*, 29-42.

Britzman, D., Santiago-Valles, K., Jimenez-Munoz, G., Lamash, L. (1993). Slips that show and tell: fashioning multiculture as a problem of representation. In C. McCarthy and W.Crichlow (Eds.). *Race, identity and representation in education.* New York: Routledge, 188-200.

Brookes, Anne-Louise. (1992). *Feminist pedagogy: an autobiographical approach.* Halifax, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.

Browne, D. (1990). Learning styles and Native Americans. *Canadian Journal of Native Education.(17)1*, 23-35.

Bull, Linda.(1991). Indian residential schooling: The native perspective. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (18)2*, Supplement, 1-64.

Burtonwood, Neil.(1986). *The culture concept in educational studies.* Berkshire, England: Nfer-Nelson Publishing.

Carney, Robert. (1982). The road to heart lake -Native people: adult learners and the future.*Canadian Journal of Native Education, (9)3*, 1-13.

Chaiton, Alf. (1977). Acculturation studies of North American Indians: a critique of the underlying framework and its applications. *Indian Ed./Canadian Journal of Native Education. Spring, (4)3*, 9-11.

Chan, Vera. (1984). Teacher's forum: a look at the minority child. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (11)3*, 61-63.

Charters-Voght, Opal. (1991). Indian control of Indian education: the path of the Upper Nicola Band. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (18)2*, 111-143.

Clifton, Rodney, Roberts, Lance.(1988). Social psychological dispositions and academic achievement of Inuit and non-Inuit students. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research,(34)4*, 332-343.

Collier Jr., John. (1973). *Alaskan eskimo education, a film analysis of cultural confrontation in the schools.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Collier, Linda. (1993). Teaching Native students at the college level. *Canadian Journal of Education, (20)1*, 108-116.

Common, R.W., Frost, L.G. (1988). The implications of the mismeasurement of Native student's intelligence through the use of standardized intelligence tests. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (15)1,* 18-32.

Cortes, (1986). The education of language minority students: A contextual interaction model. In California State Department of Education (Ed.). *Beyond Language: social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students,* 3-33.

Cummins, Bryan. (1985). Indian control of Indian education: a Burkian interpretation. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (12)3,* 15-20.

Decore, A.M., Carney, R., Urion, C. (1982). *Native people in the curriculum.* Alberta Education.

Derrida, Jacques. (1981). *Positions.* Translated by A. Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, Jacques. (1993). 'Differance', in A. Easthope and K. McGowan (Eds.). *A critical and cultural theory reader.* Toronto & Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

Devine, Heather. (1991). The role of archaeology in teaching the Native past: ideology or pedagogy. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 18(1),* 11-22.

Dworkin, D.L. and Roman, Leslie G. (Eds.). (1993). *Views beyond the border country: Raymond Williams and cultural politics.* New York: Routledge Publishing.

Eagleton, Terry. (1991). *The study of ideology.* London: Verso.

Ellsworth, Elizabeth. (1989).Why doesn't this feel empowering? working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, (59)3,* 297-325.

Elofson, Warren, Elofson, Betty Lou. (1988). Improving Native education in the province of Alberta. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (15)1,* 31-39.

Eom, Jeongmin Eom (1996). *Ethnographic narratives of Korean-Canadian youth: ethnicity, difference, culture, and identity construction,*(unpublished master's thesis). University of Alberta.

Falco Marla J. (Ed.) (1987). *Feminism and epistemology: approaches to research in politics.* New York: Haworth Press.

Fein, Leonard J. (1971). *The ecology of the public schools: an inquiry into community control.* New York: Pegasus.

Foreman, Jane. (1993). Questioning power structures and competitiveness in pedagogy - insights from North American Indian and Philippine pedagogies. *International Review of Education*, 560-575.

Foucault, Michel. (1971). The orders of discourse. *International Social Science Council*: April.

Foucault, Michel. (1978). *The history of sexuality, volume 1: An introduction.* New York: Vintage.

Foucault, Michel. (1980). *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977.* New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, Michel. (1988). *Politics, philosophy, culture: interviews and other writings.* New York: Routledge.

Friere, Paulo. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed,* New York: Seabury Press.

Fusco, Coco. (1988). Fantasies of oppositionality, *Afterimage, 16(5)*, 6-9.

Giroux, H., Penna, A., Pinar, W.(Eds.). (1981). *Hegemony, resistance, and the paradox of educational reform.* Berkeley: McCutchan, 400-427.

Giroux, Henry. A. (1991). Border pedagogy in the age of postmodernism. In S. Aronowitz and H.A. Giroux. *Postmodern education: politics, culture, and social criticism.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 114-135.

Goldberg, David Theo. (1993). *Racist culture: philosophy and the politics of meaning.* Cambridge Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.

Goddard, J. Tim. (1993). Band controlled schools: considerations for the future. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (20)1*, 163-167.

Gore, Jennifer.M. (1993). *The struggle for pedagogies: critical and feminist discourses.* New York: Routledge.

Green, Charlie. (1990). Coming of age: Native education in the 21st century. *Education Canada, (30)1*, 35-39.

Grossberg, Lawrence. (1993). Cultural studies and/in new worlds. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow. (Eds.). *Race, identity and representation in education.* NewYork: Routledge, 89-108.

Guess, Raymond. (1981). *The idea of critical ideology*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Haig-Brown, Celia. (1988). *Resistance and renewal: surviving the Indian residential school*. Tillicum Library Press.

Haig-Brown, Celia. (1995). *Taking control - power and contradiction in First Nations adult education.* Vancouver: UBC Press.

Hall, Denis. (1992). FED-BOS: The federally controlled band operated school and the no-policy policy. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (19)1*, 57-66.

Hall, Stewart. (1992). The west and the rest. In S. Hall and B. Gieben (Eds.). *Formations of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity, 275-331.

Hawthorn, H.B. (1967). *A survey of the contemporary Indians of Canada: economic, political, educational needs and policies, part 2*. Indian Affairs Branch: Ottawa.

Hedley, Max. (1976). Acculturation studies of North American Indians: a critique of the underlying framework and its implications. *Indian-Ed/Canadian Journal of Native Education, Fall, 3(3)*, 8-11.

Hekman, Susan (1987). The feminization of epistemology: gender and the social sciences. In M.J. Falco (Ed.). *Feminism and epistemology: approaches to research in women and politics*. New York: Haworth Press.

Hollander, Jim. (1993). A circular education organizational structure. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (20)1*, 157-162.

hooks, bell. (1990). *Yearning: race, gender and cultural Politics.* Boston, MA: South End Press.

Hughes-Fuller, Patricia. (1995). *Pedagogy and differnce: a study in cross-cultural adult education,* (unpublished masters thesis): University of Alberta.

Hull, Jeremy. (1990). Socioeconomic status and Native education in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (17)1*, 1-13.

John, Vera. (1976). Styles of learning-styles of teaching: reflections on the education of Navajo children. *Functions of Language in the Classroom.* Teachers College Press.

Katz, Irwin. (1972). A critique of personality approaches to negro performance, with research suggestions. *Journal of Social Issues, (25)3*, 13-17.

King, Richard. (1987). Role shock in local community control of Indian education, In J.Barman, Y. Hebert and D. McCaskill,(Eds.). *Indian education in Canada, volume 2; the challenge*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 43-62.

King, Thomas. (1993). *Green grass, running water*. Toronto: Harpers Collins.

Kleinfeld, Judith. (1972). Effective teachers of Indian and Eskimo high school students. *Eric Reports.* U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Education. Washington D.C.

Kleinfeld, Judith. (1975). Positive stereotyping: the cultural relativist in the classroom. *Human Organization, (34)*, 269-274.

Koens, Peter R.(1989). Local control within a model of the sociology of knowledge: a study in curriculum. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (16)1*, 37-44.

LaFrance, Brenda. (1994). Empowering ourselves: making education and schooling one. In J. Lipka and A. Stairs (Eds.). Negotiating the culture of Indigenous schools. *Peabody Journal of Education, (69)2*, 19-25.

Lather, Patti. (1992). Post-critical pedagogy: a feminist reading. In C. Luke & J.Gore (Eds.). *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy*. New York: Routledge, 25-51.

Leavitt, Robert M. (1990-91). Language and Cultural Content in Native Education. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, (47)*, 266-279.

Longboat, Diane. (1987). First Nations control of education: the path to our survival as nations. In J. Barman, Y. Hebert and D. McCaskill, (Eds.). *Indian education in Canada,volume 2: the challenge*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 23-40.

Luke, Carmen. & Gore, Jennifer.(Eds.). (1992). *Feminisms and critical pedagogy.* New York: Routledge.

Luke, Carmen. (1992). Feminist politics in radical pedagogy. In C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.) *Feminisms and critical pedagogy*. New York: Routledge, 120-137.

Makosis, Ralph. (1993). Accountability for Indians and land reserved for Indians. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (20)1*, 3-17.

Mathew, Nathan. (1988). Jurisdiction and control in First Nations schools evaluation. *Canadian Journal of Native Education,(15)*3, 96-114.

McAlpine, L., Cross, E., Whiteduck, G., Wolforth, J. (1990). Using two pairs of eyes to define an Aboriginal teacher education program. *Canadian Journal of Education, (17)2*, 82-87.

McCarthy, Cameron, Crichlow, Warren.(Eds.). (1993). *Race, identity and representation in education.* New York: Routledge.

McCarthy, Cameron. (1993). After the canon: knowledge and ideological representation in the multicultural discourse on curriculum reform. In C. McCarthy and W.Crichlow (Eds.). *Race, identity and representation in education.* New York: Routledge, 289-305.

McCaskill, Don. (1987). Revitalization of Indian culture: Indian cultural survival schools. In J. Barman, Y. Hebert and D. McCaskill (Eds.). *Indian Education in Canada,volume 2: the challenge.*University of British Columbia, 152-179.

McKay, Alvin., Mckay, Bert. (1987). Education as a total way of life: the Nisga's experience. In J. Barman, Y.Hebert and D. McCaskill (Eds.). *Indian education in Canada, volume 2: the challenge.* University of British Columbia.

McLaren, Peter. (1989). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education.* New York: Longman.

McShane, Damian. (1988). The relationship of intellectual and psycholinguistic abilities to the achievement gains of American Indian children. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (15)3*, 66-86.

McShane, Damian. (1988). Mental abilities testing research with American Indians: a reprise. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (15)3*, 92-100.

Mendus, Susan. (1989). Toleration and the limits of liberalism. London: MacMillan.

Miller, J.R. (1987). The irony of residential schooling. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (14)2*, 3-14.

Mohatt, Gerald V. (1994). Cultural negotiation and schooling: new idea of new clothing for an old idea? *Peabody Journal of Education, (69)2*, 172-185.

Momaday, Scott. N. (1991). In M. J. Caduto and J. Bruchac, *The Native stories from keepers of the earth.* Saskatoon: Fifth House Publishers.

Morrow, Raymond. (1994). *Critical theory and methodology.* Thousand Oakes, California: Sage Publishers.

Murphy, Kelly. (1993). *Pedagogy for postmodernity: travels in poststructuralism, feminism, and education.* (unpublished masters thesis). Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Oakes, Jill. (1988). Culture: from the Igloo to the classroom. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (15)2*, 41-48.

Ogbu, J.U. (1978). *Minority education and caste, the American system in cross-cultural perspective*. New York: Academic Press.

Omi, M. & Winant, H. (1993). On the theoretical concept of race. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.). *Race, identity and representation in education.* New York: Routledge, 3-10.

Owen, Harold. (1992). *Modal and tonal counterpoint: from Josquin to Stravinsky*. New York: Schirmer Books.

Parry, Ruth.(1978). Stigmatization and native pupils. *Indian-Ed./ Canadian Journal of Education, Fall (6)1*, 1-3.

Pepper, Floy C., Henry, Steven L.(1991). An Indian persective on self-esteem. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (18)2*, 145-160.

Perez, Laura Elisa.(1993). Opposition and the education of Chicana/os. In C. McCarthy and W. Crichlow (Eds.). *Race, identity and representation in education.* New York: Routledge, 268-279.

Perley, David G. (1993). Aboriginal education in Canada as internal colonialism. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (20)1*, 118-128.

Proulx, Paula. (1991). Anxiety in language learning. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (18)1*, 53-64.

Rampaul, W.E., Singh, M., Didyk, J. (1984). The relationship between academic achievement, self-concept, creativity, and teacher expectations among Native children in a northern Manitoba school. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, (30)3*, 213-225.

Read, E. (1983). Education programs for disadvantaged adults: a case study- project Morning Star. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (10)2*, 19-27.

Richer, Stephen.(1982). Equality to benefit from schooling: the issue of educational opportunity. In D. Forcese & S. Richer (Eds.). *Social issues: sociological views of Canada*. 336-374.

Rockhill, Kathleen (1993). Gender, language and the politics of literacy. In B. Street (Ed.).*Cambridge studies in oral and literate culture: cross-cultural approaches to literacy.* Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

Roman, Leslie. (1993). White is a color! white defensiveness, postmodernism and anti-racist pedagogy. In C. McCarthy and W. Crichlow (Eds.). *Race, identity and representation in education.* New York: Routledge, 71-88.

Rosaldo, R.(1989). *Culture and truth: The remaking of social analysis.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Ryan, James. (1989). Disciplining the Innut: normalization, characterization, and schooling. *Curriculum Inquiry, (19)4,* 379-403.

Ryan, James. (1990). Change, control, and research methodology in Native education: a response to Folds. *Curriculum Inquiry, (20)4* 439-449.

Said, Edward.(1993). The Politics of Knowledge. In C.McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.). *Race, identity and representation in education.* New York: Routledge, 306-314

Sarup, Madan (1989). *An introductory guide to post-structuralism and postmodernism.* Athens: Universityof Georgia Press.

Sarup, Madan.(1991). Multicultural and/or antiracist education. *Education and the ideologies of racism,* 29-41.

Sayer, A. (1992). *Method in social science - a realist approach.* New York: Routledge Press.

Senior, Sharon. (1993). Canadian Native intelligence studies: a brief review. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (20)1,* 148-156.

Sleeter, Christine.(1993). How white teachers construct race. In C. McCarthy & W.Crichlow (Eds.). *Race, identity and representation in education.* New York: Routledge, 157-171.

Smith, Dorothy. (1974). The ideological practice of sociology. *Catalyst, (8),* 39-54.

Smith, Dorothy. (1982). *The active text: a textual analysis of the social relations of public textual discourse.* Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Smith, Joseph Wayne. (1984). *Reductionism and cultural being: a philosophical critique of sociobiological reductionism and physicalist scientific unification.* Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Sternberg, R.J.(1988). *The triarchic mind: A new theory of human intelligence.* New York: Penguin Books.

Street, Brian. (Ed.). (1993). *Cambridge studies in oral and literate culture: cross-cultural approaches to literacy.* Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, D., Crago, M.B., McAlpine, L. (1993). Education in aboriginal communities: dilemmas around empowerment. *Canadian Journal of Native Studies, (20)1,* 176-184.

Te Hennepe, Sheila. (1993). Issues of respect: reflections of First Nations students' experiences in postsecondary anthropology classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 20(2),* 193-260.

Thakur, Markand. (1991). *Counterpoint: fundamentals of music making.* Yale University: Thomson-Shore.

Thompson, John B.(1984). *Studies in the theory of ideology.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Thwaites, Reuben Gold. (Ed.) (1897,a,b). *The Jesuit relations and allied documents, travels and explorations of the Jesuit missionaries in New France, 1610 -1791,* Cleaveland: The Burrows Brothers Company.

Tierney, William G.(1992). *Official encouragement, institutional discouragement: minorities in academe-The Native American experience.* New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Urion, Carl. (1978). Classrooms and the concept of culture: some remarks about problems in the literature. *Ind-Ed/Canadian Journal of Native Education, Summer, (5)4,* 13-14.

Urion, Carl. (1991). Changing academic discourse about Native education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (18)1,* 1-10.

Urion, Carl. (1992). Big pictures and paradoxes. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (19)1,* 1-6 .

Urion Carl. (1995). First Nations postsecondary education: a review. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (21)1,* 161-200.

Van den Berghe, P.L. (1981). The ethnic phenomenon. New York: Elsevier.

Vernon, P.E., Jackson, D.N. & Messick, S. (1988). Cultural influences on patterns of abilities in North America. In S.H. Irvine & J.W. Berry (Eds.). *Human abilities in cultural context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 208-231.

Volosinov, V.N. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. London: Seminar Press.

Wall, Denis. (1987). *Internal colonialism and Northland School Division #61: a context for decision-making,* (unpublished dissertation). University of Alberta.

Ward, Margaret S. (1983). Indian education: policy and politics, 1972-1982. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (13)2*, 10-21.

Ward, Angela, Shook, Sandra, & Marrion, Leslie.(1993). Concepts about writing: Native children in a cross-cultural setting. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (20)1*, 96-108.

West, Cornell. (1993). New cultural politics. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.). *Race, identity and representation in education.* New York: Routledge Publishers, 11-23.

Wilgosh, L., Mulcahy, R.(1993). Cognitive educational models of assessment, programming and instruction for Native learners. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (20)1*,129-135.

Willis, Paul. (1981). Cultural production is different from cultural reproduction is different from social reproduction is different from reproduction. *Interchange, (12)*, 48-67.

Wong, Yoke Sum. (1994). *Postmodernism, representations, and the subaltern woman,* (unpublished thesis).University of Alberta.

Wyatt, June D. (1979). Native involvement in curriculum development: the Native teacher as cultural broker. *Interchange, (9)1*, 17-26.

Young, John Roland.(1990). "Equality of Opportunity: Reality or Myth?" in E. Brian Titley (Ed.). *Canadian Education*. Calgary: Deltsig Press.

Young - Ing, Greg. (1988). A comparison between administration of First Nations education in Canada and Peru: divestments, losses and lacks. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, (15)3*, 24-38.